



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY
Los Angeles
This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

315

THE BIBLICAL LESSONS:

A CHAPTER ON
BIBLICAL ARCHÆOLOGY

THE BIBLICAL LESSONS:

A CHAPTER ON BIBLICAL ARCHÆOLOGY

BY THE REV. THE HAHAM
MOSES GASTER, Ph.D.

Chief Rabbi of the Spanish and Portuguese Jews' Congregation

Reprinted from the "Jewish Review"

September, November, 1912; January, 1913

LONDON
GEORGE ROUTLEDGE & SONS, LIMITED
BROADWAY HOUSE, CARTER LANE
1913

BM
663
G.2186

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction, page 1: difficulties of the problem, 1: independent character of the sources, 1: Bible reading of the Law established by Moses and Ezra, 3: Public reading of the Law on Sabbath, 4: Philo; Josephus; New Testament; Mishna, 4: Regular reading of the Law on Sabbaths by the Samaritans, 5: Antiquity of the Samaritan tradition, 6: Christian reading of the Law, 6: Reading of the Ten Commandments, 7: No Jewish Canon, 8: Division of the Pentateuch, names of the Divisions, 9.

The Scroll of the Law, 10: Division into Parashiyot, Petuhot and Setumot, 12: Earliest division, 12: Samaritan Scroll and its subdivision, 13: Septuagint, 15: Agreement of Jewish, Samaritan and Greek Texts, 16: System of and reason for subdivision, 18: Same principle for division of New Testament, 20. Kissim, 20: Piska and Pissuk te'amim, 21: Parasha cited by the initial word, or contents, 22: King's Lesson, 22: Parasha quoted by initial word, 23: The Parashiyot of the Maamadot, 25: Lessons in conjunction with or in lieu of Sacrifices, 26: Samaritan Chapters of Creation, 27: Priority of Reading over the prayer, 28.

Annual Cycle System of Reading, 29: Division into Weekly portions, 30: Parasha = weekly portion or lesson, 30: Samaritan weekly portion in annual cycle, 32: Parallel reading by Jews and Samaritans, 33: Reading of the Weekly Portion, 34: Portions of three verses, 35: Samaritan Reading of the Weekly Lesson, 35: Calling up to the Reading, 36: The Kohen and the reading of the Law, 36: Church and the Annual Cycle, 39: Lessons of the Lenten Weeks of the Greek and Syriac Church (Quadragesima), 39: Karaites' Annual cycle, 41: System of Reading, 42.

Sedarim, 43: No division into Parashiyot of Prophets and Holy Writings, 44: No graphic sign for Sedarim, 45: Whole of the Bible divided into Sedarim, 45: Non-liturgical reason for

division into Sedarim, 46 : Division of the Psalter, 47 : Difference in number and size of the Sedarim, 48 : No rules for marking Seder, 49 : Maimonides silent on Sedarim, 49 : Philological meaning of Seder = Order, 50 : Seder for division of Rabbinical Literature, 52 : Perek = chapter, 53 : Modern division of Bible into Chapters, 53.

The Sedarim and the Midrashim, 54 : Sifra, 54 : Sifra ignores Sedarim, 55 : Mekhilta idem, 55 : Peculiar Parallelism with Samaritan, 55 : Pesikta also ignores Sedarim, 56 : Peculiar Parallelism with Samaritan, 57.

Private reading, universal practice, 58 : Mikra = Pentateuch, 59 : Kara = reading of the Bible, 59 : Private Reading concurrent with Public, 61 : Daily Study of Biblical and Rabbinical Literature, 61 : The figure three in the liturgy, 63 : Agadat Bereshit, 64 : Arrangement of the Daily Readings by Portaleone and Barukh, 65 : Private reading not confined to the house, 66 : Reading and Study in the School, 66 : Pasuk, Piska = divisions for the study, 67.

Sedarim = divisions for homiletical and didactic purposes, 68 : Explanation of short and long Sedarim, 69 : Massoretic origin of the name Sedar, 71 : Sedarim in Sheeltot, 71 : Sedarim in En Hakoreh, 72 : Parasha, later development fourfold meaning, 72 : Sidra weekly lesson, 73 : Recapitulation, 73.

Alleged three years' cycle one single Talmudic reference, 74 : Three years' cycle and three and a half years' cycle, 75 : Benjamin of Tudela isolated case, not general Palestinian custom, 76 : Maimonides and his son Abraham, 77 : En Hakoreh inconclusive and self-contradictory, 78 : Conclusion, 78.

Appendix. The Samaritan Calendar (Hebrew and English), 79.

The Biblical Lessons : A Chapter on Biblical Archæology

A custom which is not proved from the Torah is nothing else than the result of an erroneous conclusion.—Soferim xiv. 10.

As the title indicates this article is a study in Biblical archæology and palæography. It is not undertaken with a view of strengthening, or in any way affecting the established customs and rites. In fact, this study is one section out of a larger work dealing with the history of the Bible, and is undertaken from the modern comparative point of view. The investigation is to lead us on step by step, from fact to fact, eschewing as much as possible hypothesis or imaginary combinations, so that we may reach results which rest on verified facts. The materials accumulated in our ancient literature will be treated from an independent point of view, and new light may be thrown upon ancient problems from our examination of all available data. A study of this kind is beset with many difficulties, the greatest of which is the indefinite character of all beginnings, the difficulty of tracing tradition to its starting-point, and, above all, the scantiness of the materials and the uncertain character of the sources, which, in many cases, cannot be chronologically fixed. It is difficult to determine, especially in our Jewish literature, how much of that which is found often in a late book is of a much earlier origin, and how much of it represents events contemporary with the author. Nowhere is this difficulty greater than in dealing with Jewish literature from the Second Temple, and down to the close of the period of Midrashic activity. I include here pseudo-epigraphic

as well as Agadic literature. And there is another point which increases the difficulties to be surmounted, viz. that everyday occurrences, customs and rites, with which the people are familiar, are very seldom committed to writing. The beginnings of Jewish literature are just as much shrouded in darkness as the beginnings of the Christian, though this latter is of a much younger date, and one might have expected to find more definite information. It will be seen, later on, that in a way we are still better equipped to explore our past than those who undertake to unravel the mystery of the beginnings of the Samaritan, Christian, Mohammedan and other religious faiths, which have all developed during the last two thousand years. One result which is outstanding from these investigations coincides with the result obtained in modern times in other fields of archæological investigations. The ancient traditions, so long misunderstood, ignored or rejected, are being fully vindicated by the latest discoveries and by the latest investigations. It is not here the place to discuss the bearing of the results achieved by the diggings in Babylon and Egypt, in Mycene and Cyprus, nor will I refer to the new chapter which has been opened by the discovery of the papyri of Elephantine, or by the Greek papyri, which throw a flood of light on Jewish antiquities, and tend to corroborate the truth of the ancient traditions almost down to the minutest detail. Now the problem which I wish to attack here is the rôle which the Bible has played in the liturgical service of the Jews, both in public and in private. Since when has the Bible been used for such educational purposes and in what manner has it been used ? The tremendous influence which this reading of the Bible has had need not be emphasised here. It is too self-evident. It lies at the very root of modern civilisation, and it has given to the divine worship a character not dreamt of by the followers of other faiths. Others have dwelt already eloquently on this unique feature of the Jewish worship,

and have drawn conclusions so exalted for the uplifting of the world that it suffices to have mentioned them. I am dealing with the more mechanical side—if I may say so, the practical working of this great principle. As indicated above, the investigation falls into two parts, (*a*) the archæological, including the palæographical, and (*b*) the historical. How far back does the tradition lead us, and how far is this tradition corroborated and strengthened by the Law? Since when was it considered a religious duty to inculcate the reading of the Bible in the Jewish worship? Our ancient tradition is unanimous on this point. It says emphatically that Moses ordained that the Law should be read to the people on every Sabbath, festival and Holy Day throughout the year.

A second tradition supplements the former, and says, Ezra established the reading of the Law to take place also on Mondays and Thursdays. There are minor differences as to the rule concerning the reading of the Law on the Sabbath afternoon, and as to the number of verses to be read on the last occasion. These will be treated later on. Here we have, then, a definite statement which is based on the injunction, Deuteronomy xxxi. 10, tracing from it a practice known throughout the whole of Jewry. That records have come down to us that the reading of the Law accompanied the prayer need not be mentioned here; it is understood. It formed part of it, and it has never been conceived independently of it in public worship. True, prayers are mentioned where no reading of the Law may have taken place, but never the reverse. In addition to this general tradition, we have a definite fact stated in the Law that the king was expected to read the Torah on certain occasions (Deut., *v.* below), and no less emphatic is ancient tradition that Ezra himself read the Law on one of those solemn occasions (Neh. viii. 1–8; ix. 3). At an earlier date also we find the High Priest, Hilkiah (II Kings xxii. 8–13; xxiii. 1–3), reading the Law in the

presence of the king and the people, not to speak of the still more decisive testimony in Joshua VIII. 34. To this practice, therefore, cannot be denied extreme antiquity, and the tradition which connects it with Moses and Ezra means that the practice is so ancient that it owes its origin almost to the time of Moses. It is necessary that we should go step by step, and establish the fact that this was not mere tradition, but tradition resting on real fact. We are told that the Haftarah was introduced at the time of the Hasmonean revolt, when Antiochus Epiphanes, in the middle of the second century, forbade the reading of the Law, and therefore the people substituted the reading from the prophets for the reading of the Law. Though this tradition is only mentioned by Abudarham, no one has ventured to dispute its value as far as the fact is concerned, that the Law was read before that time, and that at the time of the defilement of the Second Temple it was forcibly interrupted. Sirah, in his introduction to his well-known book, speaks of his grandfather as one of those who read the Law and the prophets. It cannot be doubted that it was not meant only for private purposes, but as we shall see, the High Priest and the other priests used to read a portion of the Law and the prophets in public. In the Mishna Yoma I, it is clearly stated in the preparation for the service of the Day of Atonement, that the sages of the time used to teach the High Priest to read certain portions of the Law, which he was then to read aloud to the people at the conclusion of the sacrifice. And, moreover, we are told (*ibid.*) that the sages used to read also some of the books of the Holy Writings, such as Job, Daniel, Chronicles, etc. If we come down to a little later period, we find that Philo, and at least on one or two occasions Josephus, speaks in no uncertain voice as to the reading of the Law on Sabbaths and festivals; nay, he also traces the introduction back to Moses (Josephus, *Contra Apionem*, II. 17, 175): "But Moses . . . demonstrated the law to

be the best, and the most necessary instruction of all others . . . enjoining the people to assemble together for the hearing of the law, and learn it exactly, and this not once or twice or oftener, but every Sabbath." And finally the information culled from the pages of the New Testament (Luke iv. 16-20, etc.). Jesus and Paul enter the Synagogue and read the Law and the prophets to the assembled people. Talmudic and Midrashic literature often repeats this tradition. At the time of the Mishna no question was raised as to the regular reading of the Law throughout the lands whither the Jews had gone. It is so much of an established custom that only incidental differences, exceptions in the reading which occurred during the reading of the Law, are mentioned to be discussed. The practice itself is so firmly established that it requires no special mention; it is taken for granted. I turn from the Jews to the Samaritans. It is necessary to do so for reasons which will be shown later on. With them the same practice of the reading of the Law on every Sabbath prevails; and this practice is never questioned, it is taken for granted as with the Jews. Their literature, however, is so scanty, and the information which has reached outsiders so small, all their literary monuments are comparatively so young, that it is impossible to find in them any reference to that institution of an early date. None the less, sufficient proof can be found in the literature for the Samaritan view, not only that they have been continually reading the Law in their public service, but that they trace this institution back to the earliest time, nay, to Moses. Thus, in the earliest letters sent by the Samaritans to Europe, or more properly to Scaliger, towards the end of the sixteenth century from Nablus and Egypt, the High Priest of the time—Eliezer—writes distinctly that they read the Law on every Sabbath and Holy Day, and he mentions even one of the sections read on Pesach. Similarly in the letter from Egypt the same fact is mentioned of the constant

reading of the Law on Sabbath and Holy Days (Letters published by de Sacy; in Eichhorn's *Repertorium*, Vol. XIII, 8, page 257 ff.). And in a Samaritan MS. on their customs and rites (my Cod. 872) the Samaritans distinctly state that the custom of reading the Law on every Sabbath, festival and Holy Day is a tradition handed down to them from Moses, Pinehas and the seventy Elders mentioned in the Bible. An older authority we find in Abul Fath, in his *Chronicle*, and even as far back as 1041 Josef Al Askari refers to it distinctly in his *Al-Kafi* (my Codd. 821, 878, 1159).

Close investigation extending over fifteen years ripened in me the conviction that the Samaritans have preserved for us in an almost fossilised state customs which go back to the time of the Second Temple. They represent a phase in Jewry of Jewish rites, of Jewish practices, of Jewish religious conceptions and views, which one may call pre-Talmudic, pre-Rabbinic, which concur in a remarkable degree with the traditions and customs prevailing also among the Jews outside of Jerusalem, and agree also with the most ancient traditions and customs of the Christian Church.

Justin Martyr (1st Apol. i. 67), who was a Samaritan, at least born in Samaria, and intimately acquainted with the Samaritans, refers distinctly to the custom of the public reading of the Law among the early Christians. I mention him here on the score of Samaritanism, not the Christian Church. The practice of the Christian Church, as far back as can be traced, fully corroborates the public reading of the Law. There was a regular reading of the Holy Scriptures during the public worship. At the beginning the lessons were taken only from the Old Testament. Later on also from the New. So Tertullian, Origen, and apostolic constitutions; the latter not only mention, but decree (II. 39 and 57) that the Old Testament should be read before the New; and later on more ample reference will be made to these, and to the practice of the Christian Church and the

order of the lessons in the Christian worship. This fact, that the Samaritans also have the regular reading of the Law on every Sabbath, festival and Holy Day, at once sets at rest the suggestion, which has been made, that the very reading of the Law had been introduced among the Jews as a distinctive feature against the Samaritans. Whether this may hold good for the reading of the Haftarah is a matter which cannot be discussed here, but that the reading of the Law had been taken over in common by the Jews and the Samaritans alike cannot be doubted, both following a much older tradition sacred to both. And this at once forces the establishment of the institution back to a much older date than even those records which we have been able to quote. The distinction between Jews and Samaritans was brought out in a much more decisive manner in the public reading of the Ten Commandments, on every occasion of worship in the Temple and in the synagogues.* For just in that, the most important section of the Torah, the Samaritan text differs most profoundly from the Jewish, and the very ground of separation between Jews and Samaritans centres in the additional verses which the Samaritans have added to the Ten Commandments; counting those verses as the Tenth Commandment in which the selection of Mount Gerizim seems to be not only indicated but justified by the very words of Scripture. The public reading of the Ten Commandments alone would thus bring home much more emphatically this difference which separates Jews from Samaritans, than the reading of the Law, which both held in common as the most sacred book, and in which, with few exceptions, the other differences are of a minor importance. The abolition of the practice of reading the Ten Commandments, owing to taunts of the "Minim," was really due to the fact that the "Minim" claimed authenticity for the rest of their text of the Pentateuch. Through the selection by the Jews of the

* A practice which obtains to this very day in the Samaritan worship.

Ten Commandments only, as points of difference, they would thereby tacitly admit, as it were, the correctness of the other portions. This seems to me to be the correct interpretation of this abolition. It will be seen presently that there is indeed a much more close agreement between the two texts than has hitherto been suspected, and a complete examination of the agreement will, I trust, be of no little importance for the elucidation of some of the most difficult problems in the archæology and palæography of the Bible. But before proceeding further, it was necessary to establish the fact that the practice of reading the Law was of very ancient date.

It behoves us now to endeavour to establish the manner in which the text was read. But here we are entering upon the palæographical investigation of the books of our Bible. How the whole of our Pentateuch had been written originally we do not exactly know, except for the very obvious statement in the Talmud that it was written in small scrolls, "megilot" as they are called. But no doubt the whole must have been subdivided into smaller sections, otherwise it would have been too unwieldy for any purpose, for teaching as much as for reading. Names are often the most trustworthy indications of ancient practices. The very fact that the Bible has not one title or one name for the whole of its contents brings out more clearly than anything else the fallacy of the idea of a Canon, established or sanctioned by the Synagogue. If the Synagogue had at any time established such a Canon, it would have coined a proper name for it. The absence of such a name is sufficient proof to doubt, nay, even to deny such a Canon of the Synagogue. It may be a startling proposition, but it will be discussed in another essay, forming another chapter of my studies in the history of the Bible. The Pentateuch goes by the general term Torah. The five great divisions have no proper names. Three of them are mentioned in the Mishna by a paraphrastic description, such as *Torat Kohanim* (=Leviticus), *Homesh Ha-*

pekudim (=Numbers) and Mishneh Torah (=Deuteronomy). These now take their names from the initial words. The only ancient division is into five books, each one called a Fifth (Homesh). In the Sam. MSS. to this day, the books have no titles.

The colophons at the end of each book (corresponding to the Massoretic colophons of the Hebrew Bibles) call the books the First, the Second, the Third, the Fourth, and the Fifth, without any specific names. The Greek translation represents a later tradition, and affixes a title to each of them. It calls Bereshith Genesis, Shemoth Exodus, and Debarim Deuteronomium. But we know the books only by the initial words Bereshith, Shemoth, etc. It will be seen that this practice has been continued when these books were divided into smaller sections. It is a matter of some importance; for if a book or a section is known only by the initial word, it shows a widely spread popular practice. The people must have been sufficiently familiar with those books and these sections to recognise them at once, as soon as the first word was mentioned. And just as the five books were called by the initial word, so we shall find this practice applying to smaller sections, which are also known from such initial words. There are exceptions when the titles are given from the contents and not from the initial word, and it will be interesting to see which of these sections was called by its contents rather than by the initial word. For it will be found that such sections were not popularly so known. It was a mere scientific title and not a popular one. How was the Bible divided? I will limit myself, in the first place, and for our purpose, almost exclusively to the division of the Pentateuch. There are definite indications of the Massoretic texts, which give us an undoubted clue to these ancient divisions. The whole text was subdivided into small paragraphs called by the general term Parasha. I want to make it perfectly clear that this word was not originally applied exclusively to the weekly lesson or

Perikope. This application dates from a somewhat later period, and almost entirely owes its origin to the liturgical use of the Bible. But one must not lose sight of the fact that the study of the Bible was the primary object and aim. The reading of the Bible was merely popularisation. But first and foremost the Bible was to be studied, and in order that it should be taught properly, it had to be divided into smaller sections. This ancient and to my mind oldest division of the text has been preserved with the utmost fidelity in the scrolls of the Law ; and the Massora, that guardian of the ancient tradition of our Scriptures, has preserved these divisions to our very day, and has transferred them from the written to the printed text. Happily, no one has yet interfered too much with these divisions, so as to obliterate their graphical character. It may be taken as an axiom not open to doubt or discussion that the scroll, as found now in our synagogues, has preserved to us the text in the oldest form available, and the writing and arrangement date from a period which one would be justified in calling pre-Massoretic. The Massoretic rules and prescriptions have had the object of not allowing the text, as it stands, to be modified or altered in the slightest degree. "The Massorah is a fence round the Torah," as stated in the Chapters of the Fathers. The best proof for this is that neither the Massoretic rules nor indications are found in the scroll : neither the marking of the verses, nor vowel points, nor accents, are allowed in a scroll : no names, no titles, not even dates in any shape or form, are to be found therein. The severity and rigidity of the rules for the writing of the text has reached almost its extreme limit. Not many erasures, not many corrections are allowed, and, in fact, everything that could be done to preserve the text intact and to reproduce the original with the utmost fidelity and correctness has been done with great efficiency and with excellent results. We may boldly state that the scroll read to-day does not deviate in any shape

or form from those scrolls which were torn up in the time of Antiochus and the Hasmoneans. The justification for such statements rests on the palæographic proofs which have been hitherto not sufficiently recognised, nay entirely ignored. Certain rules, no doubt, must have been laid down by the Soferim, following probably older examples, for the manner in which the text of the Pentateuch ought to be written down. It had to be written in columns; sufficient spacing between words, lines and columns had to be allowed; and the divisions between the five books had to be clearly marked in an unmistakable manner. In addition to these, other minor divisions have been introduced into the text which, as must be stated with all emphasis, were used for didactic purposes as the text-book of the moral and religious life of the people, the source of its information, and the spring of its inspiration. The study of the Law precedes the reading. The object of the reading, then, is to convey to the people as simply as possible the contents of the Law, so that it be known not only to the Sages and Pupils, but to the whole nation. It must therefore be added that the same tendency prevails here in the tradition surrounding the books as can be seen in other literature which follows lines of normal development. With us perhaps this tendency assumes a more definite form. The tendency is to preserve the older and to join on to it the results of later developments. We do not relinquish the past at the expense of the present, but utilise the present to strengthen the past. The fences round the Law double and treble in course of time, but not one of the old fences is given up. We add prayer to prayer in the development of our liturgy, but we do not substitute one for the other. And so this happened also with the system of preserving the Law, especially when it was transcribed from the scroll into book form. The scroll represents to us the text in the oldest form in the sacred service. But for didactic purposes the scroll is found to be difficult to handle, and so it was written

in pages, and here the Massora then added notes, rules and injunctions destined to preserve the original text intact. None of these marks, information, rules, etc., have found their way into the ancient scroll. It is not here the place to discuss the history of the writing of the Bible, which would form an interesting chapter by itself. It is only with the one aspect of the writing I am dealing here : division introduced into the text and marked off graphically.

It will be noticed that there is not a single column, with the exception of the two songs in Exodus and Deuteronomy, which is not broken up into two or three smaller sections, divided off in olden times very clearly one from the other by a white line. At least one line has been left unwritten so as to mark off the division. The size of this section varies : sometimes it is of eight or ten lines, and other times two or three lines. Originally these also may have been separated from the other by a large white space between. Later on in some MSS. they were separated by a small space sufficiently clear, however, to show that there is a break in the text. According to the writing these spaces have been designated as *Petuhot*, meaning open, that is, leaving a full blank line, or *Setumot*, closed section, with a blank space within the line. Meiri, in 1306, going minutely into the graphical character of the scroll, and endeavouring to establish it, in its minute details, says then that no special information has come down from olden times as to the *Petuhot* and *Setumot*. No rules had been given authoritatively as to these sections, fixing which are to be open and which are to be closed. The Talmud knows these divisions, and goes so far as to say that no *Petuhah* should be written *Setumah*, and no *Setumah* should be written *Petuhah*. Such a mistake in the mere writing of a section, or failure in marking off graphically the divisions, suffices to annul the whole column. It must be cut out from the scroll and another column substituted for it. He goes on to say that neither

in the Mishna nor in the Talmud, nor even among the writings of the Gaonim, is there found any direction for the Petuhot and the Setumot. But he follows old model codices like that used by Maimonides and another of Toledo to fix these divisions. Maimonides, before Meiri, has given in the thirteenth century laws on these open and closed sections, but he also relies on the same authority as Meiri. How old are these sections, and by what name were they known ?

The silence of the Talmudic and Rabbinical literature is easily explained. People do not put down in writing information which they assume to be known by everybody, but happily we are able to prove by means of comparative palæography that this division in the text is extremely old, the very first into which the text of the Bible had been broken up, and that it must go back to the earliest possible written copies of the Pentateuch. For curiously enough the Samaritans have also divided their scrolls of the Bible in exactly the same manner as the Jews ; they follow and preserve the very same ancient tradition which lies at the base of the Jewish and Samaritan text. They also write the Torah in the form of a scroll, and like the Jews they have no marks in the scroll of any Massoretic character, although, as has been shown by me, they also have ancient Massoretic accents dating back probably to the fourth or fifth century. Yet they are not found in the most ancient scrolls which are known to me, and which go back to the twelfth century. But I may claim to have seen also that old scroll of the Law which they declare to have been written by Abisha, in the thirteenth year after the entry of Israel into the land of Canaan, and therefore, according to them, being more than three thousand years old. It is in a very dilapidated state, the ink has eaten through the parchment. The fact of its being written on parchment detracts very considerably from the claim. But that it is very old there can be no doubt. There also I have found the writing to be in columns, and

the text divided into small sections, just like other scrolls of the twelfth century, partly in my possession and partly photographed by me. There are no signs otherwise of internal mark or division except the blank space between section and section. The verses are not divided off by colons, and the small sections agree with the large inasmuch as a complete blank line has been left between one and the other, even where the latter consists of only one or two lines. The five books are divided from one another by large spaces, just like in the Jewish scrolls. If we turn to the Samaritan Pentateuch in book form, we shall find that whilst they have preserved with absolute fidelity the small and large divisions of the text, they have inserted there the marks for dividing the verses. They have also introduced accents, and, moreover, special signs between larger divisions, to which we shall refer later on. It should be noted that to each book they have added, as we have done in our Bible in book form, Massoretic notes, giving us the minuter details of these sections. This form of outer agreement is as close as can be thought. It will be seen that the inner agreement in the selection of the portions and in the manner in which they have been divided is much more complete than has ever been dreamt of. It cannot be mere coincidence, as the agreement often goes to the minutest details. The Samaritans were certainly not the people to borrow from the Jews. On this point anyone who knows the Samaritans, their history, their life and their literature cannot come to any other conclusion. But this closeness in the outward agreement might still be challenged, and perhaps some would insist that the one, in this case the Samaritan, would depend on the other, the Jews, and that the Sam. Pent. would be a late copy of the Jewish scroll. On this point the study of the Sam. scroll must set such opinions at rest. That the Jews should have taken from the Samaritans, no one would ever think of suggesting. It is as unlikely in this

case as I hold it to be in the other. This being the case, the only solution of the problem is that the Samaritans must have taken over their scroll like the Jews at the very earliest date from a common original, and the division therefore would be proved to belong to very great antiquity. Yet there is a third test which comes to our assistance, and proves that this division is the first and the very oldest, and precedes any other into which the Bible may have been subdivided for liturgical or homiletical purposes. The Greek translation, known as the Septuagint (LXX), that of the seventy, has in a remarkable manner also preserved the very same division of the text into minor sections. Unfortunately, no reference has been made to this paleography of the Greek text, even in the admirable introduction to the Septuagint by Swete. But the old MSS., the Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, and the Alexandrinus, have all preserved the divisions. Tischendorf unfortunately has omitted to mark the blank spaces between one section and another. Swete, on the contrary, has fortunately preserved them. In this latter edition the spaces look like the Hebrew Setumot.

The agreement is so close that it proves, if proof be still required, that we have in these divisions the first and oldest attempt of arranging the text into smaller portions. The Greek translators have certainly not invented these divisions, they merely followed the Hebrew original. It is well known how anxious they were to reproduce down to the minutest detail the Hebrew original, especially in the translation of the Pentateuch. They did not shrink even from the transliteration of the Hebrew words if they offered difficulties, and in every particular they followed their text with an almost absurd faithfulness. It is just because of this accuracy and fidelity that the Greek translation was held in such high, nay, sacred, repute among the Greek-speaking Jews of Alexandria.

Its literalness served even as a basis for arithmetical and mystical speculation. The divisions, therefore, are

the divisions of the ancient text. This is not a mere hypothesis. A comparative table, which I have drawn up, and of which I give here a few specimens, will show such agreement, so as to remove any doubt, and to bring out a result as convincing as it is surprising of the antiquity and permanence of this division. It will show how faithful the Massora has been in the preservation of the text, and will satisfy us as to the reliability and antiquity of the Samaritan tradition. I take the first chapters of Genesis, and show how close this agreement is.

CHAPTER I

1st sec. 1-5	Mass. Pt.	Sam. idem.	Greek idem.
2nd „ 6-8	Mass. Pt.	Sam. idem.	Greek idem.
3rd „ 9-13	Mass. Pt.	Sam. idem.	Greek idem.
4th „ 14-19	Mass. Pt.	Sam. idem.	Greek idem.
5th „ 20-23	Mass. Pt.	Sam. idem.	Greek idem.
6th „ 24-31	Mass. Pt.	Sam. idem.	Greek idem.

Here the Greek divides into two, and takes into the 2nd section, first part of II. 1.

CHAPTER II

7th sec. 1-3	Mass. Pt.	Sam. idem.	Greek idem.
--------------	-----------	------------	-------------

In chapter II. Greek and Samaritan agree still more closely because they subdivide chapters II. and III. into more minute sections than the Massora and yet agree very closely with one another. Thus :—

8th sec. 4-7	Heb. Pt.	Sam. idem.	Greek idem.
9th „ 8-17	Sam. and Greek idem.		
10th „ 18-25	Sam. and Greek idem.		

CHAPTER III

11th sec. 1-13	Sam. and Greek idem.		
12th „ 14-17	Heb. Pt. and Sam. idem.		
13th „ 18-22	Heb. Pt. Sam. and Greek idem.		
14th „ 22-24	Heb. Pt. Sam. and Greek idem.		

CHAPTER IV (No Hebrew Division)

15th sec.	1-8	Sam. and Greek divide.
16th „	9-16	Sam. and Greek divide.
17th „	17-24	Sam. and Greek divide.

CHAPTER V

18th sec.	1-5	Heb. St. and Greek divide.
-----------	-----	----------------------------

Sam. takes verses 1 and 2 with previous division.

19th sec.	6-8	Heb. St.	Sam. idem.	Greek idem.
20th „	9-11	Heb. St.	Sam. idem.	Greek idem.
21st „	12-14	Heb. St.	Sam. idem.	Greek idem.
22nd „	15-17	Heb. St.	Sam. idem.	Greek idem.
23rd „	18-20	Heb. St.	Sam. idem.	Greek idem.
24th „	21-24	Heb. St.	Sam. idem.	Greek idem.
25th „	25-27	Heb. St.	Sam. idem.	Greek idem.
26th „	28-31	Heb. St.	Sam. idem.	Greek idem.
27th „	32	Heb. St.	Sam. idem.	Greek idem.

This at the same time settles another vexed problem, the relation between the Samaritan and the Greek. It shows that whilst there is a close affinity, there is also some definite difference between the two, and on the other hand such a close agreement between the three texts—the Hebrew, Samaritan, and the Greek—that the dependence of Samaritan on Greek can no longer be maintained. There are many more details affecting this question, which, however, cannot be dealt with here any further.

On the other hand, if we compare the divisions of the last two chapters of the Pentateuch the same parallelism will be found between all three texts, not only in the problem of dividing up the texts, but also in following certain graphical peculiarities. The Song of Moses (Deut. xxxii.) is written in our scrolls in hemistichs, absolutely identical in the Jewish and Samaritan scrolls, and in the same form also in the Greek. It is otherwise

absolutely undivided, it forms one whole section, and it has been preserved like that in the Samaritan, and no doubt also in the Greek, where the writing of the text in verses makes it difficult if not impossible to trace any sectional division. The same obtains in the last chapter in the Greek with two or three small exceptions, where it is written in prose. But the agreement between the Hebrew and Samaritan continues down to sections of one or two verses only, equally separated in both. The agreement rests upon a very old and unshaken tradition. The principle which the scribes—Soferim—followed in writing, so that the books of the Law could easily be studied, is seen more clearly in the Samaritan text than in the Hebrew. Here the ancient division has been obliterated by later superposition of other divisions and where the distinction between one section and another has now almost been entirely forgotten. They are marked in our printed editions only with a letter P or S, having lost entirely their original meaning. The Samaritans, on the contrary, preserve the clear division of the books as it is found also in our scrolls, and they go even further, they are exceedingly careful to finish the column with such a division, never breaking it up. Each column begins with a new division, a practice which has not been followed by us—only a fragmentary tradition has still been preserved by the Massoretic indication of the initial letters of six columns, the letters ביהשמי the first letters of the initial words of the columns. Some writers persist in starting every column with the letter ו (creating the tradition of ווי העמודים) or, as some scribes do, with המלך in the scroll of Esther. The result of the Samaritan practice, as seen in their scrolls, is that the last lines of the columns are often cramped, and the writing greatly reduced, so as to squeeze the words into a narrow space. In order to obviate such cramped writing no doubt our sages have dispensed with that rule, which is still followed by the Samaritans, and which can be seen in

their oldest scrolls. The division was no doubt introduced to mark the change of ideas : a new statement, the beginning of a new incident, or the introduction of a new name, were reasons for dividing that portion off from the rest. We find now in the Jerusalemite Talmud the peculiar statement of Rabbi Joshua ben Levi, who says : “ I have constantly refrained from reading in books of Agadah. Only once I looked into such a book of Agadah, and I found therein that there are 175 Parashiyot in the Torah of speaking, saying, commanding, and those 175 correspond to the life of our father Abraham. I found, moreover, that the Psalms were divided into 147 corresponding with the years of Jacob, and that there were 123 Halleluyahs corresponding with the years of Aaron.” There are two or three points of importance in this statement which require to be studied. The author lived in the third or fourth century, and he found in a book containing legendary and homiletical interpretations of the Law the statement that the Pentateuch was divided into 175 sections, and the reason given was in the regular homiletical style, because they corresponded with the years of Abraham, and he says, what is of importance now for our investigation, that they were, as it were, characterised by the very words of “speaking,” “saying” or “commanding,” which means that these sections started no doubt with, or were marked by, the words which are so often found in the Pentateuch, “and God spake” or “and God commanded.” Here we have then a clear indication of the leading principle in the division of the Law. Wherever in the text was found a portion that was sufficiently large and coherent enough to form a section they marked it off as such, whenever it began with these words, וַיֹּאמֶר (vayomer), וַיְדַבֵּר (vayedabber) and so on, or when the whole contents were filled up with one special command, or one incident in the Bible in the life of the Patriarchs which would lend itself to form a

complete section. The examples quoted above of the way in which the Hebrew, Samaritan and Greek divide the first and last chapters of the Pentateuch, explain very easily and clearly this system of division. Each one begins with *vayomer*, or, as in the last chapter of Deuteronomy, each section is given to another tribe, however small the size of it may be. In the second chapter of Genesis the Samaritan carried out this system of division more rigidly still, as he divided it up into still more minute sections. The Greek, who is the third in the order of development, carried this principle of division even to greater length. Not only in the Pentateuch, but he also divided all the other books of the Bible in a similar manner, and I have been able to trace it in some of the oldest texts in the New Testament, where the words "Jesus said" are often introduced at the beginning of these sections into which the books are so divided, whilst these words are missing in other copies not so divided. Here we find then a clear principle for the division of the text.

We gather from the words of R. Joshua ben Levi that these divisions were called *Parasha*, or *Parashiyot* (plural). The Samaritans have for this division the name *Kissa* from the root *Kss*, meaning to cut off, divide, practically like the Latin *divisio*, or section.

Another word used may have been *Piska*. This latter name may have changed its original meaning when a new use was found for it. It may therefore be that the oldest name for such division was *Piska* or *Pissuk*. It cannot have meant "verse," because the Bible was not yet divided into verses, and it is the exact word corresponding with the Samaritan *Kissa*, division or section. There are many indications that this was the original meaning of the word. It would explain what has hitherto remained somewhat of a riddle, and what had erroneously been taken as a proof for the very great antiquity of the Massoretic division of the text into verses, when we

find in the Talmud, etc., that Aher the scholar, or Nero the Emperor, or Haman are said to have asked the boy coming home from school to recite his Pissuk, hitherto translated "verse." Considering that the reply is seldom limited to one verse, and that the pupils were not expected to study in school only one verse during the day, this interpretation cannot be correct; but if it is understood that the boy was to quote something out of the Piska, of the section which he had studied, the difficulty of the question is removed. The boy could easily recite two or three verses, as indeed happened. And again the Pissuk te'amim mentioned in the Talmud, which has been taken to mean the division according to accents, when such accents had not yet been invented, will now be fully explained in the light of the above investigation, for it means division of the text according to its contents, according to the Ta'am, and in complete agreement with the division known throughout the Talmudic tradition. And this corresponds entirely with the division of the Bible as described above, a division guided by the contents of the text.

This will be made much more apparent later on, when a more detailed description of the Pesikta will be given. The chapter of curses is called the Piska of Curses.

The name, however, for the division of the Bible which has obtained the widest currency, and has retained its character almost unchanged to our very day, is Parasha. Originally it does not refer at all to the weekly lesson, but to every section, especially when used for liturgical purposes, either in the Temple or outside. It is so designated in the Mishna as Parasha. There are no other older documents to show the use of the term Parasha, but there is proof from the manner in which the portions of the Bible are mentioned as Parashiyot in the Mishna. It is there taken for granted that a mere allusion is sufficient to mark the section to be read, and to know

that not only is the reference to a section of the Bible, but, still more, which section of the Bible is referred to. Unless the use had been an already long-established one, and unless the divisions marked off were known as such, a mere citation of one word (the initial word) would not have sufficed to make the identification so complete as was evidently intended should be the case, even for the casual reader or listener. The section, for instance, dealing with the blessings of Bileam, is quoted as the Parasha Bileam (Num. xx. 21-25). The portion in Deuteronomy dealing with the duties of the king is known as the Portion of the King. But this calling of the section by the name of Parasha goes still further back. The meaning in which it was used is the same as mentioned before when dealing with the division in the Pentateuch, and it seems that the name Parasha is as old as the division of the Torah into five books. The initial word of the Parasha was taken as the title, and we find it thus in the section dealing with the service in the Temple on the Day of Atonement, when the High Priest was expected to read certain sections of the Law (Mishna Yoma vii. 1, and Sota vii. 7), for these sections are mentioned by the initial word such as Aharei Moth (Lev. xvi. 1) and Akh Beasor (*ibid.* 23, 27). He read also Numbers xxix. 7, where Numbers is called the fifth of the Pekudim.

Still more fully is this the case in the lesson which the king was expected to read. As this chapter of the Mishna is of far-reaching importance for our investigation I will give the literal translation of the text, as found in Sota vii. 8 :—

“ At the going out of the first day of the Feast of Tabernacles (at the end of the seventh year and the beginning of the eighth) they made him a seat in the court of the Temple, and he sat on it as it is said (Deut. xxxi. 10, 11). ‘And Moses commanded them saying, At the end of every seven years, in the set time of the year of release in the Feast of Tabernacles, when

all Israel is come to appear before the Lord their God in the place which he shall choose, thou shalt read this law before all Israel in their hearing.' Then the Hazan (overseer) of the Synagogue takes the scroll of the Law and gives it to the head of the Synagogue, and then the head of the Synagogue gives it to the Segan, and the Segan gives it to the High Priest, and the High Priest gives it to the King. The King, standing up, takes it, and, sitting down, he reads. The King Agrippa stood up and took it and read it standing, and the sages praised him. And when he came to the passage (Deut. xvii. 15), 'Thou mayest not put a foreigner over thee,' his eyes shed tears, and they said unto him, 'Fear not, Agrippa, thou art our brother, thou art our brother.' The King read from the beginning of Deuteronomy until Shema (Deut. vi. 4), and then he read Deuteronomy xi. 13. Then chapter xiv. 22, Thou shalt surely tithe, and afterwards from xxvi. 12, When thou hast made an end of tithing. Then the Section of the King xvii. 14, and then the blessings and curses, Deuteronomy, chapters xxvii. and xxviii., until he finished the whole Parasha. The benedictions which the High Priest spoke the King uttered also, with the exception that he substituted 'remembrance of festival' instead of 'remission of sin.' "

Thus far the Mishna. In this Mishna we have a description of an historical event which had happened in the Temple, and certainly not the first of its kind, on the contrary, perhaps the last, if this Agrippa who is mentioned here as king is the Agrippa of the time of the destruction. In the preceding Mishna we find a description of the service in the Temple as conducted by the High Priest himself. In these chapters of Mishna numerous Parashiyot are mentioned by name, and each of them derives its name only and solely from the initial word, with the single exception of the Parasha called that of the King. It is furthermore important to note that only the beginning is given, and nowhere an indication where each of these portions came to an end.

It is obvious that there was no doubt in the mind of the hearers and readers how far each of these portions went. Certainly not further than marked off by the ancient division. Everyone knew where it came to an end. This custom of mentioning the Parasha by the initial word has obtained also among the Samaritans. In one of their oldest poems, ascribed to Abisha (fourteenth or fifteenth century), sections of the Bible are also quoted by the initial word, and the Targum of the Samaritan Bible has the initial word of the section as it were as a title written over each section. So in some very old fragments from the Genizah in the Cambridge Library, and so in a copy of the Targum in my possession, and similarly in the Arabic translation of the Samaritan Pentateuch in MSS. of the thirteenth or fourteenth century. Everywhere the same custom prevails.

There can be no doubt as to the universal application of this name of Parasha to the section, and also as to the antiquity of the name applied to the section. It was sufficient to quote the first word in order to know exactly which Parasha was meant, and where a doubt existed, as in the case of the third portion read by the High Priest, then the name of the Book of the Pentateuch in which it occurred was added for elucidation. One might linger for some time over these Mishnayot, so important are they for the history of the service. I may have to refer to them once more when dealing with the reading of these sections in the Synagogue. For the time being it was necessary to point out that the name Parasha was given to portions of the Law, in smaller or larger sections, used for liturgical purposes. If we pass on to other references in the Mishna, we shall find that the portions allocated for special Sabbaths, like those preceding the Feast of Passover, are also mentioned under the name of Parasha, such as Parasha Shekalim, thus called because it deals with the Shekalim contribution by every Jew to the treasury of the Temple,

or Parasha Zakhor, in which the remembrance of Amalek is mentioned, or the Parasha Haḥodesh, the important Parasha which ushered in the very important first month of the year. It would be almost superfluous to multiply these examples in the Mishna and Talmud to prove the use of the word Parasha to denote thereby sections of the Bible, especially when connected with the service.

In the reading of the Maamadot of Genesis, ch. i., verses 1–5 are called a great Parasha, and 6–8 a small Parasha, and it is said that the great Parasha is read to two persons and the small Parasha to one person. The reading is as follows: The first person reads verses 1–3, and the second 3–5, and the third 6–8, each one three verses. The second day (Monday) verses 6–13 divided in the same manner, the third day (Tuesday) verses 9–18, the fourth day (Wednesday) 14–22, the fifth day (Thursday) 19–24, and the sixth day (Friday) verse 23 to chapter ii. 2. Here we have then the small section called Parasha just like the larger section mentioned above. Occasionally other sections in the Prophets and Holy Writings are mentioned by the name Parasha, but quite exceptionally. No other word is used for the designation of these sections, no other title ever alluded to, no other was so deeply rooted as this word for denoting the Sections. In the oldest Halachic Midrashim, notably in the Sifra, belonging probably in its original form to the second century, this very division has still been retained, with the name of Parasha. Occasionally this Midrash has preserved also the name Dibbur or Dibra, which has been mentioned above. It would be perhaps hazardous as yet to discuss the name of Parashiyot in the old Halachic and Agadic Midrashim unless we have established the contention on unassailable ground that down to a very late period, perhaps down to the sixth or seventh century, no other name has been applied to these sections.

In what manner were these sections used for the

liturgy in the Temple and outside the Temple ? We shall have to distinguish between the use made of special sections of the Law or the Pentateuch for select occasions like New Moon, specially appointed days in the Bible for holy observances, when additional sacrifices had to be brought, and when other ritual ceremonies were prescribed to be performed in conjunction with sacrifices such as heave-offering (the *Ömer*), the firstlings (*Bikkurim*), etc., and the other readings of the Law in the Temple, like the reading by the King on the Jubilee. In addition to these we shall have to consider the consecutive reading of the Law for didactic purposes and in the liturgy. Here we are face to face with a difficult problem, not easy of solution. What was the form of the worship of the Jews outside the Temple ? They could not offer up sacrifices on those specially appointed days and seasons. What kind of practice did they institute in order, as it were, to perform so sacred a duty incumbent upon them ? That they had synagogues cannot be doubted, places of assembly for worship and prayer, and no doubt also for study. That they gathered on festive occasions, especially on Sabbaths, New Moon, and other great days, requires no proof. The evidence given at the beginning of this article satisfies us amply on that head. It does not affect our question, what kind of service they had in the Temple of Yeb, or rather Assuan, as disclosed by the papyri. The references are too vague to allow us to come to a definite conclusion. But a careful examination has satisfied me that no real sacrifices were sanctioned. Only incense offerings, and other bloodless offerings, seem to be referred to in these precious fragments of the past. In the Temple of Onias in Alexandria, we are distinctly told that they read the Law publicly ; no mention is made of any sacrifices. The service of the Maamadot may help us however, if not to solve, at any rate to approach the solution of these problems, and if we study in addition the Samaritan

liturgy and some other indications in the history of our own liturgy, what may have been an hypothesis will be raised to a certainty. We have, moreover, the unanimous tradition of Jews and Samaritans on this point, namely, that in addition to the first chapter of Genesis other portions—Parashiyot—were selected in their entirety and read one after the other; and that on such special occasions, like New Moon, New Year, Pesah, etc., those small sections—Parashiyot—in which the observance of that special day was enjoined, or the actions to be performed on that day were described, these sections were read in lieu of the sacrifices in which they could not take part, the Temple being too far away. This happened whilst the Temple existed. And still more so, when they were no longer in a position to perform them after the destruction of the Temple. In the liturgy, notably in that of the special days, we find, in fact, incorporated in the part of the prayer such short sections or Parashiyot taken from the Bible which refer to the special character of the day.

The Samaritans on their part have not only retained the first chapter of Genesis, reading that also in small portions every day like the Maamadot did in olden times, but they call them almost by the same name as they are called in the Mishna, “The Chapters of Creation,” *Kisse deberiah*, and then they read a whole series of short Parashiyot or *Kışsin*, as they call them, inserting as we do precisely the same Parashiyot from the Pentateuch on the several special occasions, notably when they happen to be on the Sabbath. The reading of the Shemă is also the Samaritan practice. The first Mishna of Berakhot already speaks of the reading of the Shemă as an old-established custom, and calls it by the initial word Shemă, although it embraces three independent sections, and we find later on in the Talmud a question by R. Napha why the two sections of the Shemă are arranged in an order contrary to that in Deuteronomy. (It is unfortunate that all this

part which gives us a clear insight into the liturgy of the Samaritans has been entirely omitted by Dr. A. Cowley in his edition of the Samaritan liturgy. Not a trace is left, and the references that are made sometimes in the text are therefore absolutely unintelligible.) I refrain from referring to the other parts of our liturgy, consisting of a mosaic of Biblical verses, selected with a view to the festival, or the special occasion when they are to be recited, such as verses referring to the Sabbath or New Moon, or on other occasions such as in the Selihot the Musaph Amidah of New Year, etc., collected together. On an elaborate scale this practice is found among the Samaritans and Karaites. This is mentioned here for the purpose only of showing that there was a further development in the introduction of Biblical verses in the liturgy after the time when the use of the smaller portions had become rigidly fixed. The part forming the prayer proper in which these had taken their place did not exhaust all the requirements of the service. The people were not satisfied with the shorter sections which merely informed them on occasions of the Biblical injunction referring to the importance and character of the day they were celebrating. The Bible could not remain to them a closed book, and probably the reading of the Law in its entirety preceded the Order of the service proper. The latter found its expression by the worship in the Temple, and by such devotional exercises as they were ready to institute in imitation of the Temple worship. But the study and reading of the Law stood by itself, and it was not confined to the centres of the learned. Tradition tells that the institution of the public reading of the Law goes back to the very beginnings of the foundation of the people as the People of God. Throughout the Bible we read, "Thou shalt meditate on it," and "Thou shalt read it"; and, "Delight in the Law." It is too well known to require any further proof that the study of the Law was considered a most meri-

torious act, and to read publicly in the Law was to make it possible for others to partake of that merit. As far back as our tradition goes, public reading and private study of the Law seem to be an integral part of the religious life of the people. I am dealing with these questions later on when following up the course which these practices have taken during the centuries, but no one denies the fact that the Law was read publicly to the people, as mentioned by Josephus, Philo, etc.

The question which we have now to face is: Upon what system was this reading of the Law carried out? Here again the same old tradition informs us that Ezra had appointed that the curses in Leviticus should be read before the Feast of Weeks and the curses in Deuteronomy before the New Year. This is a definite starting-point which shows unmistakably that the reading of the whole of the Pentateuch must have been completed in one year, otherwise it would have been impossible so to regulate the reading that these portions should fall in their consecutive order at those fixed periods. It is impossible to imagine that only select sections could have been meant, for there would have been then no reason to fix a definite period. The rule which is laid down that close upon four months must elapse between the last chapter of Leviticus and Deuteronomy xxvii. and xxviii., gives us just the space required for the two books (Numbers and Deuteronomy i.-xxvii.), whilst the other seven months could be allotted to the first three books of the Pentateuch. The month of Tishri was given up to the reading of the select sections referring to the Festivals and Holy Days. The tradition in the Mishna knows, in fact, no other division of the Pentateuch; it assumes the annual cycle, and the discussion as in Megillah, 29 ff., turns on finding a way to adjust the reading of the weekly portions with the additional readings for special Sabbaths, such as the four special Sabbaths before Pesah, or that Sabbath on which

Rosh Hodesh may happen to fall, meaning the Sabbath in Hanukah. The question was, how to arrange for the reading of Parashat Nesiim (the portion of the offerings of the princes) or those in which the Shekalim, Amalek, and others are to be mentioned in conjunction with, or in lieu of, the regular weekly portion. These and all the other references to the reading of the Law presuppose only an annual cycle.

How was the Bible then divided? Into weekly Portions. The old division into Parashiyot was not touched. There is no new larger portion which breaks up the smaller section or begins in the middle. It is always a Petuha (rarely a Setuma) which separates the preceding from the succeeding portion. The only change which has taken place, if change it be, was to give to the word Parasha a somewhat different and more restricted meaning, which becomes more and more identified with the weekly portion, to the detriment of the older application of the word, causing thereby some confusion. Anyone who finds, for instance, either in the Samaritan Letter or in the Rabbinical documents, the name of one of the divisions quoted as Parasha has no doubt as to what it really means. The difficulty arises when reading older documents, Mishna, etc., and to some extent the Sifra, to understand exactly what was meant by that term. The meaning of Parasha as weekly portion became soon an established fact. The Samaritans, who call their smaller portions Kissa, have chosen the same word Parasha, writing it like the Hebrew, but pronouncing it Barasha, to designate the weekly portion into which they divide the Bible. This investigation has not the aim of proving that the Torah was read publicly. The question which we are pursuing and endeavouring to settle is the manner in which the public reading, and to a certain extent the private study and reading, was carried out. Was there no other system except the annual? Is there no trace of

any different system of reading found in the literature clearly and unmistakably enunciated as such? And do we find in the Palæography of the Biblical text any indication or justification for such an assumption? These are the main points and to these we shall adhere. It was necessary to establish, in the first place, the primary division into Parashiyot or Sections as the very basis for the division of the Law into Portions. I have then proceeded to trace the way in which these smaller Sections were used in the public worship in the Temple by the High Priest, and by the King on the one hand, and by the delegates as Maamadot in private worship. The latter has shown us how certain portionsst were read, in what may be termed a semi-public service. It was only carried on during week-days and by a select few. We have, moreover, seen that other Sections—Parashiyot—were embodied in the service outside the Temple, i.e. in the Synagogue, and on special occasions, notably on the Sabbath, New Moon, Festivals, etc. Furthermore, that in accordance with the whole Jewish tradition, the Law has been divided into as many portions (lessons or Perikopes) as there are weeks in the year. The number has been fixed at fifty-four. During the year there are at least a few Sabbaths on which Festivals occur, for which separate readings have been instituted. These larger portions have also been called Parasha, and have assumed the names of the initial smaller Parasha or section with which they begin. The name by which the latter was known was transferred to the weekly lesson. Originally, no doubt, the first and the last of the smaller Parashiyot were mentioned in order to circumscribe and define exactly the extent of the weekly portion. But later on, the custom having become deeply rooted, it sufficed to mention only the name of the initial small Parasha.

Now the fact that these portions are quoted by the initial words is the best proof possible that they

had been already established for a long time, and that the Bible had been subdivided for public readings in such manner, for the mere reference to the first word was enough to characterise the portion meant. The reference to *Lekh Lekha*, or *Noah*, was quite sufficient for the people to understand to what it referred. The Samaritans, in fact, have retained the older form of quotation. Originally the portion was, e.g., from *Lekh Lekha* to the portion *Vayera*, or *Mikḵeš* to *Vayehi*, and the Samaritans to this very day so designate their Portions, although in some instances for brevity's sake they quote only the beginning (*v. Letters to Scaliger* quoted above). They also know only the annual cycle, as observed by Jews and Karaites. The Samaritans have done exactly the same, though in not a few instances they differ considerably from the Jews in the starting-point of their *Parasha*. They sometimes begin in the middle of one of our *Parashiyot*, but they follow the same system and provide like the Jews also for a larger number of *Parashiyot* for the intercalary year, when four Sabbaths are added. They do it in the same manner as we do, by dividing three or four longer *Parashiyot* into six or eight shorter ones, or vice versa, combining two or three into one, agreeing even in this detail in some instances with the practice of the Jews. They combine, e.g., *Matot* and *Mas'ei* together with *Pinehas*, and the Portion corresponding to *Nissabim*, *Vayelekh*, as we do. A close examination furthermore shows that they never started from the middle of a *Ḳissa*. Like the Jews, they start invariably from the beginning of those smaller Sections marked by us as *Pet* or *Set*, as the case may be, and clearly distinguished by them as a *Pet* by a blank line between. Dr. Cowley has reprinted the list of *Parashiyot* as found by him in one of the Petermann MSS. in Berlin. But unfortunately he has not noticed that the list for Genesis which he published, is the extended list for the Leap Year, and thus creates some confusion in the under-

standing of the division (*J.Q.R.*, Vol. VII, 1894, p. 137 ff). He starts Exodus with number 14, while he leaves off Genesis with 18. The same list is also found in my Cod. 1135.

It being of importance I reprint here in the Appendix the whole calendar for one year like my Cod. 1150, with all the indications week by week of the Portions read, wherein also other calendaristic details of the highest interest are given. That the Samaritan division has not been done haphazard, but rests on very ancient tradition, is evident from the fact that on one or two occasions they start the "Barasha" with the very Portions which we have selected for our Festivals and Holy Days. I will refer to them anon, when examining the Sifra and Pesikta.

Before I proceed to describe the way in which the Portions are read, it is necessary to draw attention to the further parallelism between Jews and Samaritans, showing the extreme antiquity of the practice followed by both. Both begin the reading of the Law immediately after the Feast of Tabernacles. It must be remembered that the King read the Law at the Jubilee, also at the end of Tabernacles, and this, no doubt, remained a starting-point for the annual reading for the future. What is still more significant in the highest degree is the arrangement in which both Jews and Samaritans agree that the curses in Leviticus are read before the Feast of Weeks, and those in Deuteronomy before the New Year. A Leap Year makes no difference with this arrangement, for the Samaritans expand the fourteen Portions into which they divide Genesis into eighteen, in order to provide for their four intercalary Sabbaths. They begin the reading of the second book of the Law invariably on the first Sabbath of the eleventh month (Nisan is the first), and Leviticus with the first Sabbath of Nisan. From this rule they do not deviate. Remembering then that this arrangement of the reading of the curses and blessings is traced back

by tradition to Ezra, we have here an unexpected corroboration by the reading of the Samaritans. No less curious is, that on the last Sabbath of the eleventh month (or the first of the twelfth) an additional Portion is read, namely, Exodus xxx. 12, the well-known additional Section to our Parasha Shekalim read by us precisely at the same time. These are not haphazard coincidences, for they run parallel in the minute details of liturgical arrangement. Both point thus to a far greater antiquity than has hitherto been believed, for it cannot be stated often enough that the Samaritans have borrowed just as little directly from Rabbinical Judaism as the Jews have borrowed from the Samaritans.

We shall now consider the way in which the weekly lesson is read by the Jews, Samaritans, etc. How was this weekly Portion read? Did the people take any part in the reading, and if so, in what manner? It is impossible to assume, as some have done, that originally the people read only one verse, and that three verses formed the whole of the weekly Portion. The very size of the ancient Parasha, which very seldom is less than three verses and often consists of a larger number of verses, precludes even the hypothetical assumption of the possibility of such a short reading. It would be almost ludicrous to imagine that men should be called to read before the public one single verse, considering that they were reading so many Parashiyot in their prayers like those mentioned above, whilst the whole of the reading of the Law should consist of one verse. That three men should be called up on a solemn day to exhibit the greatness and beauty of the Law by the reading of one single verse each seems too preposterous to be believed. There is not a shred of evidence for such a system. The Mishna cited above makes it perfectly clear that in the week-day semi-public reading of the Maamadot, each of the persons was expected to read at least three verses. Note that this was for a week-

day lesson. Why the minimum of three verses should have been established is not mentioned anywhere. But the reason is not far to seek. The priestly blessing consists of three verses, and this no doubt was taken as a model for the reading. The analogy of the Samaritans does not sufficiently assist us in the history of the reading of the Law, at any rate in one direction ; although their practice is very suggestive in other directions. They do not read from the Scroll as far as I have been able to ascertain. They have the Scrolls, it is true, and they have used them in ancient times. In the later centuries, however, they only take them out from the Ark, show them to the people at the conclusion of the prayer, and then settle down to read from their MS. books. The cause may be that not being able to obtain pure parchment from goat skins sacrificed ritually and properly prepared owing to the loss of the ashes of the Red Heifer, and being in a state of Levitical impurity, they had no more "pure" parchment from the fifteenth century on, as they assured me, and are therefore, no doubt, afraid to wear out the few parchment Scrolls by too constant use. They therefore use their books, which are mostly written on paper. They have a double system : one at the conclusion of the morning service and one at the conclusion of the midday service. In both the whole congregation takes part. The reading in the morning is not, however, carried on in the "Kinsha" (their Synagogue), but in the "Bet-kahana" (the house where the priests are dwelling), and there the reading partakes of a character reminding one as emphatically as possible of the injunction mentioned in the Talmud, that every man should read the Bible, each verse twice in Hebrew and once in the Targum. This system of reading the text twice and the Targum once, I have seen done by the Yemenite Jews in Jerusalem on Shabuoth afternoon, when squatting on the floor in their Synagogue they read the Book of Ruth in such manner. The Samaritans similarly read alternately ;

the reader—always one of the priests—reads and the congregation joins in either by repeating the verse or reading the verses alternately during the morning service. They have now forgotten the Targum, which they used to read alternately with the Hebrew text, in the same manner, I understand, down to about 150 years ago, when the practice ceased, because the people had lost the knowledge of the ancient Samaritan tongue in which the Targum is composed, and therefore it had lost its meaning. They read the whole Parasha, verse by verse, in the morning. At the midday service we find they read the whole Parasha again, but then the priest starts and reads the first three or four verses of each *Kiṣṣa* corresponding to our small Section, and the people afterwards read the other half until they finish the whole of the weekly lesson. Calling up therefore does not exist. With us the former practice of reading the text with the Targum alternately, now also given up, had been the general rule, and has had an influence upon the study of the Law to a far greater extent than has hitherto been surmised. “It is incumbent upon every individual to read the whole of the weekly portion to himself, twice in the Hebrew text and once in the Targum” (*Berakhot*, 8a). This will be considered in connection with the private form of study. But we are still discussing the public reading, where the *Meturgeman* had his place, and where, no doubt, the reading was carried out exactly in the same manner as the Samaritans did and do. Faint indications of this are preserved by the way in which the Song of Moses was read alternately by precentor and people, and by the practice of the congregation chiming in at the end of the sections in the Sabbath Portion. This is merely a remnant of the older practice in which the congregation, no doubt, repeated the Hebrew text, verse by verse, and listened to the *Meturgeman* who explained it to them in the vernacular.

As regards the minor subdivision or the calling up of

people to the reading of the Law, we find that the Levites in the Temple already are stated to have read the Portion in precisely the same manner, dividing the weekly Portion into seven smaller Sections as we do. A Synagogue from which the Scroll of the Law is taken is mentioned in the Mishna referred to before. It is from that Synagogue that the Hazan took the Scroll and gave it to the High Priest, and he to the King. So there must have been a Synagogue within the precincts of the Temple itself. This division into seven is not an artificial one as it might appear from a casual study of the passage in the Talmud, where a gradual development seems to be indicated by the enumeration of the various occasions in which the number of people to be called up—that is who are to take their share in the public reading—is successively increased from three on week-days to four on New Moon, etc., until seven on Sabbath. The seven portions, no doubt, correspond with the seven days of the week, and are unquestionably a very old practice. But this is a minor point which I cannot pursue any further here.

What part the Kohen, as such, may have taken in the public reading of the Law is one of the problems which await solution. It is intimately connected with the question raised by me, as to the form of the Jewish worship outside the Temple. In close relation to it stands, of course, the position held by the Kohen in the community.

The fact that the Samaritans still give to the Kohen a pre-eminent position in all religious questions cannot be overlooked. Of no less importance is the Christian practice which gives to the priest functions absolutely identical with those claimed by the Jewish Kohen. He alone was and is allowed to deal with the Sacraments and holy offices. In the Church he is primarily, or the only person who leads and reads the prayer. He was presumably also the leader and reader in the Synagogue, and

hence his claim to be the first to take part in the reading of the Law, just as the Samaritan priests do to this very day, in their service. If, as suggested above, the reading of three verses is an imitation of the threefold blessing of the priest, it is obvious that the Kohen should be expected to read also, in the first instance, the portion of the Law and afterwards to retain at least the first position in the reading. To return now to the system of reading, the practice of the Church shows that it knows only an annual cycle. The Church extended it over the Old and New Testaments, originally reading only the Old, until the New was considered to be of equal sanctity, that is, when the Heathen-Christian element prevailed over the Jewish-Christian. Then they slowly eliminated the reading of the Old, and substituted for it almost exclusively the reading of the New Testament, retaining, however, the system of an annual cycle. The general principle of the lessons of the Church is exactly the same as that of the Jewish lesson. On festive occasions special portions fitted for the occasion are read from the Old Testament and New Testament bearing on the importance of the day; and throughout the special season of the year selections are made from the Bible for the same purpose of public reading. The comparison which I established before when dealing with the sectional division between the Hebrew, Samaritan, and Greek Bibles will help us to understand the practice of the Church. It follows here absolutely and entirely the example of the Synagogue and the Kinsha. The lessons from the Old Testament for the Christian Lectionaries, notably in the Triodion for the Quadregesima, are sections taken from the LXX, determined by the original division of the Greek text; they also begin with the first verse of a section and finish with the last verse. They never begin the lesson in the middle, just as the Jews never start any lesson from the middle of a small Parasha, or the Samaritans in the middle of a Kissa. For the

Church the Books of the Bible stand on a different plane, and preference is given or no doubt was given to those chapters of the Prophets which lent themselves to a Christological interpretation. When the new dispensation dispensed practically with "the Law," it was obvious that no such prominence would be given to portions from the Law as is done by Jews and Samaritans.

It is curious how little is known of the beginnings of the ancient Christian liturgy. The recent researches of Glaue, *Die Vorlesung heiliger Schriften im Gottesdienste*, and the book of Harnack, *Über den Privaten Gebrauch der Heiligen Schriften in d. Alten Kirche* (Leipzig, 1912), throw very little light on the reading of lessons from the Old Testament in the first two centuries of the Christian Church. But the investigation which I have carried out leaves no doubt as to the system and the practice followed in the primitive Church. The result from the lesson of the Church falls into line with the result obtained from the readings in the Synagogue and Kinsha. They all point in the same direction and prove mutually their antiquity. Direct dependence of one upon the other is utterly impossible, for though they agree in the main principle, they differ sufficiently in detail to obviate the possibility of any direct borrowing.

Another point is the size of the lesson of the Church. On an average it is about twenty-five to thirty verses; herein again, no doubt, the Church follows the old example of the Jews where the smaller daily lesson certainly contained more than eight or nine verses. No question thus of a possible reading consisting of one or three verses alone even for a week-day, and still less for a Sabbath, Festival or other Holy Day. These lessons must have been of the size of the actual Parasha. As the matter is of still wider importance, I will mention here the lesson from the Old Testament read during the Lenten weeks (from Ash Wednesday to Easter) accord-

ing to the Byzantine and the Syriac rites, limiting myself to the lessons of the first ten chapters of Genesis; the former from the Triodion, the latter according to the list given in Maclean's *East Syrian Daily Offices*, page 284. In the Greek the lessons read are as follows :—

I. Mon., Gen. I. 1–13. Tues., 14–23. Wed., 24–Gen. II. 3. Thurs., II. 4–19.

II. Mon., III. 21 ff. Tues., IV. 8 ff. Wed., IV. 16. Thurs., V. 1–24.

III. Mon., VI. 9–22. Tues., VII. 5. Wed., VII. 6–9. Thurs., VII. 11–VIII. 3. Fri., VIII. 4–21*a*.

IV. Mon., VIII. 21*b*—IX. 7. Tues., IX. 8. Wed., IX. 18. Thurs., X. 1–9.

In the Syriac the reading from the first ten chapters of Genesis is :—

I. Mon., Gen. I. 1–20. Tues., I. 20–II. 8. Wed., II. 8 to end. Thurs., III. 1–20. Fri., III. 20 to end.

II. Sun., V. 18–32. Fri., V. 32 to end of VI.

III. Sun., VII. Fri., IX. 8 to end.

Of these two the Greek seems to be the older, and the other—the Syriac—a somewhat later division; yet both follow the same principle of providing daily lessons from the Old Testament. They take as basis for their division what will be certainly a great surprise to students of the history of the Christian liturgy, a division of the text which coincides down to the minutest detail with the Samaritan division of the Hebrew text. It is noteworthy, for instance, that Genesis VIII. 21 should be broken up in the Greek lesson into two verses, and that one lesson should finish with 21*a* and the other begin with 21*b*, a division which coincides absolutely with the Samaritan division, and is not found even in the Septuagint.

It is not necessary to pursue this comparison much further. It is quite sufficient to prove (*a*) that the continuous reading of the text was the practice of

the Church, (b) that the reading was extended over a good number of verses, although no one was called up, and the whole of the reading was left entirely to the priest, (c) that the ancient subdivision of the text into small Parashiyot was taken as the basis for the arrangement of the lessons, none venturing to break up these sections. If we then turn to the Palestine Syriac Lectionary of the Gospels, dating probably from the fourth or fifth century, the same tradition meets us for dividing the whole of the Gospels into large sections for the purpose of reading them as lessons during divine service, and finishing the reading in the course of one year. The tradition of the Church is thus uniform with that of the Kinsha and the Synagogue ; for the Christians certainly would not have invented an annual cycle or arranged the reading of the sacred Scriptures unless they followed a universally accepted tradition considered ancient, well established and holy. Nowhere is there to be found a trace of any other division of the Bible, and nowhere is there an attempt of establishing a cycle of lessons extending beyond one year.

The Karaites may be mentioned here, although they are of a very late origin ; but in view of their dislike to everything that appeared to them to be of Rabbinical origin, and their claim to be the representatives of the older, undiluted Biblical tradition, if they had found anywhere a practice which they thought to be of a recent origin, or an arrangement based merely upon Rabbinical interpretation, they would certainly have altered it, just to show their opposition and their independence. The yearly cycle as given by Bashyatchi in his *Aderet Eliyahu* (Odessa, f. 105a), is precisely the same as that of the Jews, nor does the author of this Karaite Code of Laws in any degree remotely point or allude to any other form of reading but the annual cycle. He says, moreover, it is based by them on the statement in the Book of Ezra (Neh. viii. 18), “ Also day by day,

from the first day unto the last day, he read in the Book of the law of God," that is, as they explain it, from the day after Succoth to the same day a year hence. The *daily* lessons in the churches and the practice of the Anglican Church seem to rest also on this statement. The Karaites call their weekly lessons "Parasha," and they have no other name for them. They read the Parasha almost in the same manner as we do. In the Prayer Book it is mentioned that "on the Sabbath in which no Scroll is taken out the people read from the Humash, viz. the book; according to custom the Haham reads the first verse, the people continue and the Haham concludes." This reminds one very forcibly of the system prevailing among the Samaritans. But when they read out of the Scroll, they also divide the Portions into seven on the Sabbath, and the Kohen is the first to be called up to the reading.

The list of Haftarat given on f. 105*b* is not entirely different, as some have asserted, from that of the Jews. From Numbers to the end of Deuteronomy, with one or two exceptions, the Haftarat are precisely the same as those read by the Jews, and a notable fact is that the special Haftarat for the "three weeks of trouble" and the "seven weeks of comfort" are almost the same as the Jewish. Of the three between 17th of Tammuz and 9th of Ab two are identical. The difference, therefore, between Jews and Karaites amounts to very little; and is not much greater than that existing between the Sephardic, Ashkenazic, Yemenite, Italian, Persian, not to speak of other Rites. We find thus the same tradition even in the question of Haftarat, that only an annual cycle is known and practised. We see by their choice of chapters from the Prophets to be used as Haftarat that they believed the chapters read by the Jews as Haftarat rested on Rabbinical authority only; and therefore, whilst accepting the principle of the reading of the Haftarah, they often selected deliberately other chapters in lieu of those read

by the Jews. Up to a certain date there was some latitude in the choice of the Haftarah, as the divergence between the various Jewish Rites shows.

But the Karaites never ventured to alter the reading of the Law ; they followed exactly the same principle and the same tradition as the Jews ; for it was to them an equally ancient and sacred tradition, although they claim for themselves an independent calculation of the calendar and different counting of the seven weeks which separate Pesach from Shebuoth. The latter falls with them always on a Sunday as with the Samaritans and the ancient Sadducees. But despite this difference, the division of the Bible is mainly the same, and they know only an annual cycle.

At a very late period, so late that its beginnings are not difficult to determine, a new word, Seder—or rather the plural, Sedarim—turns up, notably in Masoretic treatises, with a specific meaning. It is there employed to mark divisions of the Bible. I will not as yet discuss the interpretation placed upon this new division. For the time being we are considering this division of the Bible from a purely palæographical and archæological point of view. It has already been shown that the scroll of the Bible in accordance with the tradition preserved by the Jews, Samaritans, and Christians alike was written in a uniform manner and with definite divisions marked off, and that such divisions have never changed. On the contrary, they formed a rigid framework for any ulterior arrangement of the text of the Bible. So rigid was this division, that the Law would never allow the slightest deviation, and any change sufficed to make the Scroll unfit for religious service. The column was eliminated or so corrected as to re-establish the proper form of writing. It has been shown that the Parashiyot could not be divided ; and it was later on laid down as a rule that no man called up to the Law could break off the reading unless he either read to the end of that section (Parasha) or at least left

three verses before the end to enable another person to be called up.

The great antiquity of this division is shown by the mode of writing the scrolls. A blank line originally divided one section from the other, and a larger space divided one of the five books from the other. The weekly portion falls in entirely with this arrangement, and no weekly lesson is known to begin in the middle of a section. Now this tradition is limited to the Pentateuch. No indications are found in the Mishna or Talmud of any such divisions of the other Books of the Bible, Prophets, Holy Writings, except for one or two rare instances where the words *Parasha* or *Perek* are used, to which reference will be made later on ; there is no question of *Parashiyot* as a regular institution or division. No rules are laid down for writing and dividing these Books of the Bible in a special, clearly prescribed manner, nor is there any direction as to what would make such a book fit or unfit for service when used for the reading of the *Haftarah*. The same holds good for the five scrolls, not excepting the Book of Esther. When the Talmud discusses at length, in the treatise *Megillah*, how the latter is to be written and read, no reference is made to any internal division or *Parasha* ; in fact, there existed none which has been authoritatively or universally recognised and followed as such, and there is nowhere greater independence than in the copies of these parts of the Bible.*

Even in the MSS. containing only the *Haftarot*, and therefore destined to be used in the Synagogue for religious service and to be read immediately after the Law, great obscurity prevails. There is no fixed tradition as to how these portions from the Prophets should be written and how they should be subdivided. No *Haftarah* nor any other portion of the Bible out-

* It is a pity that Prof. Kittle should have taken it wantonly upon himself to introduce irrelevant and misleading divisions in his edition of the Bible. He has no authority for it, and still less to decide which is to be a *Petuha* and which a *Setuma* (an open or a closed section) in Prophets and Holy Writings.

side the Pentateuch has ever been called Parasha. If, however, the Sedarim represent and, as has been assumed, stand in direct connection with the public reading of the Law in the Synagogue, it is more than surprising that no graphic trace of such a division should be found in any MSS. of whatever age and place. In those few MSS. in which the Sedarim are marked, this is not done, let it be noted, in the Scroll but in the book form ; the letter $\square$ (Seder) is written at the margin to show where the Seder begins, just like any other Massoretic marginal note of late date and of no legal value. There is no division inside the text ; there is no blank space left, there is no internal sign, nothing to show that there is a break. Persons unacquainted with the Massoretic Sigla might be induced to believe that it is the sign for Setuma, which by a mistake had got into the margin. Even that $\square$ is not found in any of the Biblical MSS. before the twelfth century and rarely even later. But what goes further to prove the recent and non-liturgical origin of this division is that it has been extended to the whole of the Bible. No one can maintain that the Prophets and Holy Writings have ever been read publicly in connection with the liturgy and in any consecutive order. That the whole of the Bible should have been so divided is evidence that it has not been done in obedience to any regulation or principle according to which they were to be used as lessons. There are many books of the Holy Writings which have never been used as such in their entirety, or in any large portions, for any divine service ; such as Ezra, Nehemiah, Daniel, Chronicles, Proverbs, or even Job. The reading of these books is mentioned in Mishna Yoma among those which the sages read to the High Priest privately. They were singled out for the reading to the High Priest, no doubt, for that very reason that they were otherwise never used in public worship. Of the Prophets themselves, it is well known, only selected chapters are read as Haftarot. It would be a remark-

able claim, after the whole of the Bible had been divided into some 452 divisions for no liturgical purpose, to say that the same division limited to the Pentateuch rests upon a definite liturgical use to which the Pentateuch has been put. Either the division embraces the whole and rests on a principle affecting the whole of the Bible, or it does not. It cannot be claimed to be applied in one way for one section (the Law), and to owe its origin separately for that portion, whilst no explanation can be given for the extension of that principle to the rest of the Bible. If the Pentateuch had been divided into 150 weekly lessons for liturgical purposes, the division of the rest of the books of the Bible could not have been made for the same reason, as it cannot be applied to the Prophets and Holy Writings. It is therefore clear that Sedarim have nothing to do with Synagogue lessons or Perikopes.

It cannot be denied that the other books of the Bible must also have been divided into smaller sections ; but there is no fixed tradition for such division nor any decisive authoritative rule as to the character of the section, whether it be open or closed. It can be shown, however, that the example of the Pentateuch served as the model in general outline for the divisions of the other parts of the Bible. The oldest division is that of the Psalter, which has been broken up into five books, like the Pentateuch. The Psalter was the hymn-book in the Temple, as proved by the ancient testimony of the Levites singing Psalms in the time of Ezra and later (Rosh. Hash. 31*a*), an example followed by the Synagogue and the Church. Curiously enough, the Samaritans call their hymns “tehilot” (or, tehilelot), probably the older name for our Book of Psalms—(so Ben Asher)—“tehilim” being the later form and used to differentiate between the Biblical book and other liturgical hymns. To this day the Synagogue makes large use of the Psalter. This division of the Psalter into five books belongs to a very ancient period, long

before the Massora. Proof thereof is the doxology at the end of each of the last four books ; and in our daily morning service, after the doxology with which the Halleluyahs conclude, we also recite the doxologies of the preceding four books together, as if we had read the whole of the Psalter during that service.* The Psalter was subsequently divided into thirty sections, a certain number of Psalms being set aside for each day of the month ; a division with which we shall deal later. The five Megillot, or scrolls, no doubt owe their origin and arrangement to the same desire of following the example of the Law's division into five books. The five scrolls were used also in the liturgy. But besides this division of these books (Psalter and five Megillot) we must presume that all the books of the Bible were divided into smaller or larger sections, following the basis laid down for the division of the Pentateuch into Parashiyot, either when starting a new subject, or a new prophecy, or a new date.

It would be of real importance if the Sedarim could be shown to represent an ancient division. But the divisions found in ancient MSS. of the Bible are of a totally different character, agreeing in the main with the small sections or Parashiyot of the Pentateuch. The Septuagint is also subdivided into smaller portions, though those found in the Greek text do not tally with those found in some of the Hebrew manuscript Bibles. If we now continue our examination of the Sedarim we shall find that the tradition about the numbers is anything but reliable. According to one account there are 154, according to another 158, and according to a third 167 Sedarim. None of them can be explained on any possible calculation. Moreover, if we are to follow Ginsburg (*Introduction to the Bible*, pp. 33-4), there is a fourth tradition contained in a MS. with the Massora

* Of course each Psalm forms a small section for itself like the Parasha of the Law, and we find indeed some Psalms are quoted as Parasha or Perek in the Talmud, Ber. II, 1-2 ; Berach 9*b* and 13*b* ; Gittin 60*a* ; Rosh. Hash. 30*b*. (A small portion in Isaiah is also called Parasha : Meg. 24*a*.)

Parva which disagrees with the others. On examining these Sedarim a little more closely, we shall be struck by the incongruity of the size. Assuming for argument's sake that these Sedarim served some liturgical purpose and constituted the weekly lesson in the Synagogue, we find that some of them consist of seven, eight, or fifteen verses, whilst others run into chapters. Surely it is impossible to imagine that those who were responsible for such a division should not have tried to standardise these weekly lessons, and make them more or less of equal size. Are we to assume that those who used the Sedarim for their weekly lesson had gone entirely against the rules laid down for Jewish public worship, that they should establish for themselves new rules and regulations which flew in the face of all the tradition of the past ; that they should have ignored the practice of the Temple and the practice of the Synagogue as described in the Mishna and the Talmud, that they should have ignored the ancient division of Parashiyot and started their weekly portions from the middle of these sections as, e.g., in Genesis XIX. 1 ; XXVII. 28, etc., that they should deviate from the number of persons to be called up, the number of verses to be read on such occasions, all this for centuries, and, forsooth, in Palestine, without leaving a single trace in the practice and terminology of the Synagogue ? Not only is there no mention anywhere in the whole literature of any weekly division by the name of Seder, but also the readings from the Prophets must have been entirely different and independent in size and selection of those that have formed the readings of the Prophets as Haftarot from remote antiquity. For the Sedarim in the Prophets are, almost without exception, of a much larger size than the Haftarot ; a Seder often being equal to two or three chapters. Isaiah has only twenty-six, Ezekiel twenty-nine, the Minor Prophets twenty-one, and the whole of the Book of Psalms nineteen. If these Sedarim hold good also

for Haftarot, what a profound difference between the obligatory weekly lesson of the Torah consisting of perhaps seven or eight verses, and the Haftarah from the Prophet of fifty or sixty verses!

In addition to this deficiency from a palæographical point of view of distinctive signs by which these Sedarim are marked off in the Scroll, there is also a complete absence of any direction or rule for the marking of such division. If one remembers the strictness of the rules laid down for the open and closed sections, it is more than surprising that no care should have been taken, if this division into Sedarim were an old one, to lay down some rule or some legal guide for marking them in the Scroll. It is inconceivable that such a division could have obtained over a wider area over the whole of Palestine, and in ancient times covering the whole of the Talmudic period, without any legal formulation of the rules and principles underlying such division. How little they could be or have been connected with the history of the Scroll and the use to which it was put in the public service can be seen by the continued silence of all authorities, almost without exception. It is sufficient to quote Maimonides, especially as I shall have to refer to him in connection with the alleged three-year cycle. In his *Hilkhot Sefer Torah*, Sect. Ahabah, he devotes a long chapter (chapter VIII.) to a minute and detailed description of the open and closed sections of the Pentateuch. He enumerates each one and describes very carefully whether it should be open or closed, and he gives as his authority the famous model code of Ben Asher, originally kept in Jerusalem and then used by him in Egypt. But he never mentions even the word Seder, and does not seem to be aware of any other authoritative division of the Law but that into Parashiyot. No less interesting is the still more minute description of the Scroll by Meiri, who in 1305 wrote his *Kiryat Sefer*, containing a minute treatment of every letter, nay, of every jot and tittle,

in the sacred Scroll. He calls every one of these smaller sections by the ancient name of Parasha, but he knows nothing of any other division of the Bible or of the supposed Sedarim. On the contrary, as far as I am aware, he is the first to call our usual weekly Portion, i.e. of the annual cycle, by the name of Seder.

I turn now from the palæographical to the philological investigation of the word Seder and its use in Rabbinical literature. It will be found that in the whole of that literature—Mishna, Talmud, Agadah—the word Seder has only one definite meaning, that of order, the succession of things, facts, deeds, performances, the complex of actions that follow one another in a definite series. It has never been connected with any division or section referring to the Bible.

There is not one single example which can be adduced, as far as I am aware, to show that it has ever been taken as equivalent to Parasha, either in the ancient meaning of the original smaller section, or in the later development which made that word identical with the weekly Portion (lesson, perikopes). It is necessary to settle this point as clearly as possible ; for only thus many a misconception will disappear. I will take a few examples at random from the Mishna and Talmud, and it will be seen that the word Seder has never been used otherwise but as the designation of order, or sequence. What can we want more than the expression “ Seder of the Parashiyot,” used in Megillah III. 4 in connection with the discussion of the four special portions for the four Sabbaths ? and it is furthermore stated (*ibid.*) that they (the Parashiyot) are read Kesidran, i.e. in their proper “ order.” We have the word Seder Hayom (Mishna Yoma I. 3), meaning the whole “ order ” of service for the Day of Atonement ; and (*ibid.* v. 7) everything is described in proper “ order ”—*al haseder*. We have Seder Berakhot, “ order ” of the blessings and benedictions, in Bera. 48*b* ; the “ order ” of the blessing after meals (*ibid.*). We have Seder

Vidui, "order" of confession (*ibid.* 31*a*), Seder Tefilah, the "order" of Prayer (Rosh. Hash. 17*b*). Special stress must be laid on the following citation. When the Talmud wishes to describe the "order" of the books of the Bible (Baba Bathra 14*b*), it speaks of them as the Sidran Shel Nebiim, and Sidran Shel Kethubim, the "order" of the Books of the Prophets and the "order" of the Books of the Holy Writings. The Talmud does not refer here to any internal division called "Seder," but only to the sequence of the books. No less interesting is the reference to the "order" of the creation, which is called Sidrê Bereshit (Sabb. 53*b*, Kethub. 103*b*); whilst when these chapters are mentioned as "lessons" in the liturgy they are called Parashiyot, as shown above. We have, furthermore, the Seder of the Maamadot in Taanit III. 7, meaning the "order" of the successive Maamadot, but not referring to the Parashiyot read at the Maamadot. We have Seder Hakeriah, "order" of the reading of the Law, but nothing that would indicate that thereby was meant which special portion of the Law was to be read. It is simply used to describe the "order" in which the people are to be called up—Kohen first, Levite second, and Yisrael third, when the Scroll is taken out for the portion of the day, Sabbath, New Moon, Hanukah, etc. In Yoma 33*a* we find Abbaye arranges the Seder Hama'arakhah, or the "order" of the daily service in the Temple.

Turning to our Prayer Book we find, e.g. in the Mussaf Amidah, "*Temidin kesidran umussafim kehilkhatan*," where seder and halakhah are used as synonyms; and in the Ashkenazic form we have also Siddurê Nesakhêha, "order" of its drink-offerings, the form Siddur reminding one of the title "Order of Prayers," i.e. Prayer Book. So far has this word been identified with sequence and proper arrangement of the consecutive order of prayers, that the Prayer Book has got the name Siddur instead of Seder Hatefilah. Compare with this the Syriac name for the Prayer Book, Takhsa, which

means "order." It would be easy to multiply examples which would prove one and the same fact, that the word Seder was never used in any other meaning but that of "order," and never applied through the whole of the ancient Talmudic literature either to any portion of the Bible or to any portion of the Law.

On the contrary, this title is employed for non-Biblical Rabbinical literature exclusively, while Parasha served to denote exclusively divisions of the Bible and notably of the Law. It is into Sedarim and not into Parashiyot that the Mishna is divided, and no one has ever used another term to designate the division of the Mishna. Speaking, for instance, of the Seder Moed everyone would at once know that the "order" of the Oral laws referring to the festivals is meant, whilst, for instance, no Parasha has ever been cited by the title Seder. One does not find in the whole literature, Seder Bereschith, Seder Noah, or a Seder Yithro, or any other. The fact that the word Sedarim had been applied exclusively, at any rate during the whole of the Talmudic period, to the compilations of the Oral Law ought at once to put us on our guard when we see the same name applied to the written Law. Moreover, when applied to the Mishna, the word Seder is the general title for a whole series of laws and ordinances which are subdivided into Masekhtot and Perakim. All these are new forms used exclusively in connection with the Oral Law and Rabbinical tradition. The word Seder does not as yet represent a small division, equivalent with the Parasha of the Bible. A long time must elapse and profound changes must take place before such a transfer could be possible ; and, as will be seen later, a change in the meaning attached to this word is due to a different school of thought and belongs to a period when with changed conditions a new significance was attached to older words.

Take now the word Perck, also seldom, if ever, used in connection with the Biblical books. It is

applied part exclusively to Rabbinical literature and the same change in the use of the name has taken place many centuries later. Firstly, in the Mishna, the subdivision is called Perek (Perakim). Then we find Pirke Aboth, the "Chapters of the Fathers"; Pirke Hekhalot, "Chapters of the Heavenly Halls." We have Pirke de R. Eliezer, Perakim of R. Jehudah, and so on. They are never called "parasha"; and, on the other hand, none of the divisions of the Bible is ever known or quoted as Perek. Centuries elapsed; the Bible was divided by the Christians into chapters, and then the word Perek was used for this modern non-Jewish division of the Bible. It is found in the Massoretic closing notes of the various books of the printed Bible; but in the Massora we find layers in the terms used, some of extreme antiquity, and others of so recent an origin as these Perakim of the fifteenth or sixteenth century. A term found in Massoretic writings need not be considered as old unless it is proved by other evidence to be of ancient origin. The conclusion from the philological point of view is also obvious. Even if the Bible or Pentateuch would ever have been divided for liturgical purposes into smaller sections, if any proof would have been forthcoming that there was any practice but an annual cycle for the reading, and that there had been in general use another division for a cycle of three years or three and a half years, surely these divisions would have been marked by certain definite names clinging to them as has been shown to be the invariable rule with the weekly portion. No writer, with one single exception, to be noted later, down to comparatively modern times, has identified this division with any liturgical purpose, and has explained the Sedarim to have been introduced for such an aim. But a certain connection has been alleged to exist between the Sedarim and certain Midrashim. It is, therefore, of importance to establish in the first place the relation between the older Agadic compilations with these Sedarim, in order to

see whether such old works as the Mekhilta, Sifra, Pesikta, etc., had any knowledge or took any cognisance of these Sedarim. Those who have tried to identify the Sedarim with the triennial cycle have never asked themselves in what relation these stand, and have rather hastily drawn conclusions from premises which never warranted such conclusions, even if we should agree that some of the later Midrashim start from verses which mark the beginning of the so-called Sedarim. Nothing even then would show that these Sedarim served the liturgical purpose of an annual, or still less a triennial, cycle, but would only show that the Bible or the Pentateuch had been subdivided in an additional manner. It will then be for us to find out the reason, if we can, for such subdivision.

If we now examine the Sifra, the oldest of the halachic Midrashim, perhaps contemporary with the Mishna or perhaps a little older, and in its structural arrangement no doubt going back to the tradition of R. Akiba, we shall reach a more definite result. The agreement between the Midrash and the smaller—not the weekly—Parashiyot is so close as to leave no doubt that no other division was recognised or known by the author. The Sifra is divided into eighty sections, and Hoffman, in his introduction to the Midrashim, shows that certain portions had been deliberately left out of the Sifra. The number of these omitted Parashiyot amounted to fourteen or sixteen. These added to the eighty would bring up the sum to ninety-six, the exact number of Parashiyot, Petuhot, and Setumot, into which Leviticus is divided. No room there for any Seder, and no trace of any Seder. It is worth while dwelling here, however briefly, on the terminology used in the Sifra to designate divisions. It will show that in addition to Parasha, also Perek is the most constant term used; the latter alternating as it were with the former. In addition to these, other terms are sporadically used, showing that the terminology was still some-

what fluid, not yet rigidly fixed except in the case of the Parasha. The other terms found in the Sifra are Megillah, as Megillat Meşora, (col. 134 ed., Venice), Megillat Emor (col. 184), and sometimes Dibbura, an archaic form for parasha (*vide* above), col. 85 and 211; once we find the word Sidra (col. 222) at the end of Behar. All these terms seemed to be used more or less promiscuously, and parasha itself sometimes designated a section, sometimes a lesson or perikope, and sometimes merely indicated the contents, such as Parasha Nega'im, Parasha Zabim, similar to Parashat Hamelekh in the Mishna.

An analysis of the Mekhilta may follow. As far as it has been preserved—and very likely it began with the present first chapter—it is divided into nine Masekhtot, and subdivided into smaller Parashiyot. No other term is apparently used. For the larger division the term Masekhet is used, which, as shown above, is applied to the sections of the Mishna, and which is never applied to any Biblical book. Masekhet means “textus”; hence our word text, a web, a thing woven together by the hand of the author. It will be evident that whilst the author of the Mekhilta keeps rigorously to the ancient division of Parashiyot and knows also the Perikope, he had no knowledge of any division of the Bible corresponding with Sedarim. If on one or two occasions the chapter of the Mekhilta begins with the passage where the Seder is now marked, it is a mere coincidence; for on those two occasions the weekly Perikopes begin in the same place (*vñ.* and *vñ.*). On the other hand, in three passages the author's division seems to run parallel with that found in the Samaritan Bible, starting from what is now a Samaritan Perikope (Nos. I., VI., VII.). On one occasion the Masekhet comes to an end with the Samaritan Perikope, as in *ixα*. In conformity with the halachic character of this Midrash, those chapters of Exodus which contain no Halacha are omitted in the Mekhilta, such as chapters XXIII. 20 to

xxxI. 11 ; xxxI. 18 to the end of xxxiv., xxxv. 4 to the end of the book, and very likely also chapters i. to xii., these being relegated to the Agadic Midrash. Moreover, it must be pointed out that some of the Masekhtot cover only small sections, such as those to Exodus xvii. 8-16, xxxI. 12-17, and xxv. 1-3. Of these the former contains the episode of Amalek connected especially with Purim, and the last two deal with injunctions concerning the strict observance of the Sabbath. But throughout there is no reference to the Sedarim, and not even a remote agreement with any division into Sedarim. It is obvious that at the time of the composition of the Mekhilta such division did not exist. Passing on from the Mekhilta to the Sifrē, we find here the weekly lessons are clearly marked, but these may be due perhaps to a late hand. On the other hand, it has the minute subdivisions of the text corresponding to a large extent with the division of the Bible into verses ; each of these little divisions is called Piska, that is, a small school lesson, an agadic, or halachic interpretation—as the case may be—of one or a few verses together. Of no less consequence will be now an analysis of the Pesikta—the oldest collection of a purely agadic interpretation of the text both of the Law and of the Prophets, as far as they were read as lessons in the service. An examination of the Pesikta will serve also the purpose of bringing out the fact that to the author only one set of Haftarot and Parashiyot was known, and they were all enclosed within an annual cycle. He knew no two Parashiyot for any festival, or, for any one special day, two different Haftarot.

Another cycle (biennial or triennial) would obviously have produced a larger number of Haftarot, and each of these would have formed the subject for a separate homiletical interpretation. But the Pesikta knows only the one universally acknowledged set of lessons and Haftarot. But I will consider the Pesikta here solely

from the point of view of its relation to the Sedarim—tracing whether there is any connection between them, and whether the Sedarim lay at the basis, or were the starting-point of the homilies—more especially because the Pesikta is of a purely Palestinian origin, and it is alleged that a triennial cycle was the rule in Palestine, and that the Sedarim were the divisions of the Bible in accordance with that cycle. The number of homilies contained in the Pesikta—which, needless to add, is also the oldest collection and goes back at least to the fourth or fifth century—is thirty-two. Of these, thirteen (XIII.—XXII. and XXIV.—XXVI.) take their text from the Prophets, being Haftarot; and two (XXIX. and XXXI.) have no text and will therefore be omitted. Of the remaining seventeen not one starts from the same verse as a Seder, unless it is at the same time the beginning of a Perikope. On all other occasions the starting-point is the old Parasha or section, and on some occasions, the weekly Parasha; and what is of special significance, we find also a remarkable parallel between the Pesikta and the division into Perikope of the Samaritans. In one of these instances the Pesikta agrees also with the Mekhilta (No. v.), but in the other two instances (Mekhilta VI., XII.) the Pesikta is entirely independent and stands by itself in this agreement. For each of these Pesiktot we have Talmudic authority, some being already mentioned in the Mishna, others in the Talmud, the Babylonian as well as the Palestinian showing that the reading of these lessons as a fixed tradition goes back to very ancient times, and was never questioned either in Palestine or Babylon. From the foregoing examination no doubt can be left that down to the fifth century at least the Sedarim did not exist. Such a division of the Bible in addition to, and superseding, as it were, that into Parashiyot both as section and Perikope was not known. It had no connection whatsoever with liturgy. It was not allowed to be marked by any sign in the writing of the text, nor did it influence the ancient

exegesis of the Law. Moreover, the legal authorities took no notice of it in laying down the rules for the writing or for the reading of the text. Still the existence of a division not only of the Pentateuch but also of the whole of the Bible into Sedarim cannot be gainsaid. It will be my endeavour to trace the late origin of these Sedarim, and to show the place which they occupy in the history of the text of the Bible and in that of its interpretation. It is for this reason that the examination of Agadic Midrashim in their relation to the Sedarim will be undertaken later.

In addition to the public reading of the Bible, and side by side with it, went the private reading or meditation. The preceding investigation has thus far led us to one result based on the archæological and palæographical facts preserved from ancient times and scattered throughout the whole literature. They all point unmistakably to the existence of only one system of public reading. The technical terms used leave no room for any other interpretation or for the existence of any other way of reading the Law in public, and prove that the system was to read the whole of the Pentateuch from the end of Succoth to the end of Succoth. It would be, however, a grave mistake to assume that the public reading of the Bible was the beginning and end of the use to which the Bible has been put. From a purely historical point of view it is clear that the public reading was only one aspect of the study of the Bible, and that before and concurrent with the public reading, the private reading and study must have been a universal practice. Whilst in Deuteronomy it is enjoined that the King should read the Bible (or such portions of it as were prescribed according to the tradition) once in every seven years to the assembled people, in the Bible the command of reading and meditating on the Law was repeated ever and anon. It is out of this private reading that the public reading grew; for it is not easy to assume that every Jew was sufficiently educated to

read the Bible for himself, and therefore the public reading was instituted to assist in the fulfilment of that duty, and to make the Book better known among the masses. It would be almost superfluous to quote here all the passages in the Bible where reference to the reading and study of the Law is mentioned or emphasised. From the first command to Joshua (chap. i. 8) to the dying exhortation of David to Solomon (1 Kings ii. 3), almost to the last words of the prophet Malachi and the most important public action of Ezra (Neh. viii. 8), all record the same fact, the reading of the Bible in public and in private; and the whole of the later development rests and turns exclusively on the study and application of the Law. From 1 Maccabees (i. 56 f.) we learn that many private persons were possessed of books of the Law, which, by the order of the King Antiochus, were rent and then burned by fire. No doubt these were Bibles in the possession of private persons who used them for their private reading. I might in passing refer also to the "Sefer" of R. Meir, a famous private model codex of the Law. So much was "reading" identified with the reading of the Bible that to the Pentateuch the very name "Mikra," i.e. "the reading book," was given. The Bible was, in the true sense, the textbook of the people. In this sense our sages have interpreted the word that occurs in Nehemiah, and they state that Ezra read . . . "bami-kra" "in the Law" (Meg. 3a).

It is interesting to follow up the use of the word Kara in the old Rabbinic literature, where we find it almost exclusively used for Bible-reading. When, however, the Mishna or the Oral Law is mentioned as being read, another verb was substituted; "tana" or "shana."* In Mishna Yoma i. 6 the word Kara is used to denote that the High Priest read the portion of the Bible, and it is said that, in case he did not know how to read, they taught him. Surely the High Priest

* Cf. Ket. 17a of one who read the Bible and studied the Mishna; *dekarē vetanē*.

could not have been an uneducated man : but though the Hellenising priests may have had a very good general Greek culture, they might not have been equally well versed in the Hebrew reading of the Law. In various parts of the Mishna (Meg. II. and III.) the very same verb is used for the reading of the Megillah—the Hebrew Scroll. The expression “keriat shema,” the private recitation morning and evening of the three sections of the Bible known as Shemā (Deut. vi. 4–9, xi. 13–24 ; Num. xv. 37–41), has become quite a technical term, and occurs ever so many times in this stereotyped form. It is unnecessary to multiply examples, for the word is never used in any other meaning throughout the Mishna and Talmud except for reading the Law in public as well as in private. To teach a man the Bible was called “makrē,” which does not mean simply to teach him to read, but to teach him the Bible, as is made clear by Ned. iv. 3. The meaning of the word “mikra” was occasionally extended even to a small portion of the Bible, not an entire volume, but a text or portion of it (Sota iv. 2 ; Yeb. 11*b*), and in numerous passages the technical rule is laid down that no “mikra” loses its original meaning whatever another interpretation may put into it (Sanhed. 34*a*, 101*a* ; Sota 14*b*, etc.). A Biblical scholar was called Kara, that is, the “read one” (Kiddush 49*b*). Hence the name of the Karaites, who call themselves Benē Mikra, the children, or faithful followers, of the Mikra. A man who calls himself Kara is a man who could read (i.e. he knows) the Law, the Prophets, and the Holy Writings. The development went even further, and a verse of the Bible was then called Kera, a thing or piece read. The original meaning of the reading had so entirely been forgotten that this name was applied to the verse. It is an alternate name for “katub,” the latter derived from the root “katab,” to write. Hence it often occurs in the Mishna and the Talmud. In the ancient exegetical rules (in the Boraitha), R. Ishmael

uses this term exclusively to denote the verse. *Kera* as the "read" verse occurs in this meaning very often in the Talmudic literature (*Berachot* 2*a* ; *Sanhed.* 45*b*, 71*a* ; *Moed. Kat.* 3*b*, etc.). This was the only name by which a verse of the Bible is described as such and quoted in the Mishna and in the Talmud. The application of the root *Kara* only and solely to the reading of the Law, is in itself a proof sufficient to show how universal the practice was. It is also of importance to notice here that *Pasuk* never means, or could mean, a verse in the Talmud. We shall presently deal with this expression, but for the time being it is sufficient to establish this practice of private reading and to show that it is very old, and that it had developed its own terminology differentiating its practice from any other reading or study. It was a devotional and didactic reading in the house, in the family, and in the school.

A statement in the Talmud makes it a law that a man is to finish his *Parashiyot* with the people, that is, he is to make his private reading concurrent with the public reading, not allowing the people to go ahead, but to keep pace with the public reading (*Berachot* 8*a*). We are also told that the teacher and the children may prepare their *Parashiyot* by lamplight (*Tosefta Sabbath* i. 12 ; *Sabb.* 13*b*), on which occasion the expression "Mesader *Parashiyot*" is used, which we must bear in mind. It shows that the pupils and teacher had to arrange their *Parashiyot* according to a definite order (*Seder*). We are told that R. Simeon ben Johai left no *Parasha* in the Torah which he had not studied (*Sukka* 25*a*). So important was the private reading of the Law that every man was expected to perform it every day, and to repeat the same blessing as when called up to read the Law in public. This practice has been retained to our very day. Small sections of the Law are read every morning, and the blessing is said in the earlier part of the daily service. A similar blessing is said on the Prophets when read as *Haftarah*.

The oldest examples of these blessings are found when the High Priest read the Law to the people on the Day of Atonement (*v.* above). In order that the reading of the Holy Writings should not interfere with the reading of the Law and the Prophets and with the homiletical interpretation during the public worship, it was not allowed to read the Holy Writings during the Morning Service, or to meditate on them in the same manner. Yet in spite of this desire of keeping every part of the Bible in its proper place during the service, we find none the less that, whenever a man started reading the Holy Writings, he still was expected to say the blessing mentioned in *Soferim* XIII. 1. This principle of private devotion and of continuous reading of the Law had become more and more a universal practice. In the course of centuries it was extended from the Law proper to the Mishna and Talmud, and later to the mystical literature. The original short Maamadot, used only by the respective Mishmarot, became afterwards of general use, and the Maamadot already in the Siddur of Rav Amram* of the ninth or tenth century were extended over the seven days of the week, and additional pieces were added to them taken from the Rabbinical literature.

This was a natural development. As already remarked, the principle which underlies the development of Jewish history, liturgy, Law, etc., is to preserve the old and to build upon it, enlarging and developing. Nothing that once had been the possession of the people was discarded, but if circumstances changed it was put to a different use. The reading of the Bible had been, however, so engrained in the conscience and practice of the people, that it could only go on expanding and developing on the lines laid down by tradition and usage. Daily study and daily prayer went hand in hand, but study was considered superior. A Beth ha-midrash enjoined greater respect and greater sanctity than

* *v.* Baer Abodat Israel Rödelheim, 1868, page 495 and note.

Beth ha-keneset—the school stood higher than the synagogue. “One may sell a synagogue to build a school, but one may not sell a school to build a synagogue.” The mere study of the portions referring to sacrifices was equivalent to the bringing of them. Such is the Jewish Law. There is no need to dwell here on the deep attachment of the people to the practice which familiarised them with the contents of the Bible. In order to facilitate the understanding they did not shrink from adding the recital of the Targum—the *lingua vulgare* of the time. When that Targum or Aramaic translation became still more popular, and owing to the influence of Arabic domination was threatened with extinction, it also became somewhat of a holy language. This Targum developed later on into a more paraphrastic translation. The only points which I wish to note here are the slow expansion from translation into paraphrastic legend and homily, and the fact that each verse was read three times, twice in Hebrew and once in Aramaic. This recurrence of the figure three is very notable. It seems to play a very definite rôle in the history of the Bible in the synagogue. Not only is the Bible divided into three sections—the Law, the Prophets, and the Holy Writings—but the Bible is read by the Maamad three times daily. Each one reads at least three verses. The Bible is, moreover, read three times publicly during the week—on Saturday, Monday, and Thursday. Three persons are called up to the Law, representing the three divisions, Kohen, Levite, and Yisrael. Every verse must be read practically three times, twice in Hebrew and once in Targum. The Samaritans read their Parasha three times during the Sabbath—evening, morning, and midday (*Ramsha*, *safra*, and *sehrem*—this is their pronunciation of our *sahoraim*). One might mention here the repetition of Psalm CXLV. three times daily, not to speak of the thrice holy in the Kedushah.

The private reading was certainly not limited only

to the Law. It must have extended, in ancient times, over the whole of the Bible. It is quite true that in the public service, only the Law and the Prophets were allowed to be read ; and nothing was allowed to intervene between these readings and the homiletic exposition which accompanied the reading : and with it, more or less, the service was brought to a close. It is for this reason that the Holy Writings were excluded ; but we find that after Minḥa on the Sabbath it was allowed to read the Holy Writings. And, moreover, as mentioned above, a special blessing had to be said before the recital of these Writings. And this reading must have been half private, half public, more or less connected with the homiletical exposition in the afternoon, in which the Law, the Prophets, and the Holy Writings were equally represented. A Midrash has come down to us of uncertain date, though of late origin, called Agadat Bereshit, in which this three-fold reading has been preserved. The book contains eighty-four chapters composed of groups of three paragraphs each, in which the text for the first of the groups is taken for the homiletical exposition from the Law, for the second from the Prophets, and for the third from the Holy Writings, mostly Psalms. Here we have a proof for the further development of private reading and homiletical exposition in conjunction with the public reading. To this very day a remnant of the practice has been preserved, at any rate in the Sephardic rite. On Sabbath afternoon, at the conclusion of the Minḥa Service, three verses are read from the Parasha of the next week, although a large section had been read out of the scroll during the service. It is thus practically repeated. Then three verses are read from the Prophets, i.e. from the Haftarah of next week, and from the Holy Writings Psalm cxxxiv. is recited ; or instead, three verses from the Megillot before the seasons of the year on which these are read in full. Other verses, among them two doxologies, are recited before and after the

reading. In olden times the Targum to these verses was also recited, which was later replaced by the Spanish translation of the Targum, thus giving it fully the character of the study combined with the homiletical interpretation by the Meturgeman.

When an equal position was granted to the Oral Law in private study and reading, the Rabbis enjoined that a man should divide his time into three sections, and he should devote one third to the Torah (Bible), another to the Mishna, and a third to the Gemarah (Kiddushin, 30). In accordance with this principle, even in our prayers the first part of the service is made to contain portions from the Torah, Mishna, and Gemarah, by which means we are fulfilling this command of daily study, and at the conclusion of this section we say the proper Kaddish de-Rabbanan. The pre-eminence given to three is seen also in the "three-fold blessing" of the priests, which may have been the starting-point. But the people obviously never rested content with the obligatory public reading of the Law three times only during the week, and the system of daily private readings was slowly evolved. It is best seen in the subdivision of the Psalter into thirty daily sections. Further systems of reading had accordingly been arranged extending over the year in which the Pentateuch was to be read. It was subdivided into daily lessons. Such a system of reading—extending over the whole year, and following the order of the Parashiyot or weekly lessons, and containing portions from the Law, the Prophets, the Holy Writings, Mishna, Talmud, Midrash, and Zohar—has been elaborated by Portaleone in his *Shilte Haggibborim*, Part III, f. 133b-170a, for every night of the year; and in the *Hok Le Yisrael*, by Ishak Barukh, each Parash is so arranged in daily readings that it is completed in the week in complete accordance with the statement of the Talmud. Each day contains lessons from the Law, the Prophets (Hebrew and Targum), the Holy

Writings, Mishna, Halakha, Zohar, and in later editions Mussar, providing thus a complete cycle of lessons for every day of the year.

The private reading was not confined to the house. Reading and study go hand in hand, for it was a reading with the object of imbibing the eternal truths of the Holy Writ. The Bible formed the basis of all education, and what was done at home was merely a reflex of what was done at school or the continuation of the education. The daily lesson was given at school, whilst the daily reading was afterwards continued at home, and it must have been the endeavour of the teacher, as it has been for so many centuries, to keep pace at school with the service in the synagogue, and to teach the boys always the Parasha of the week, so that they might be well prepared to follow the reading in the synagogue and to benefit by the homiletical interpretation which followed the public reading. The weekly portion must therefore have been divided into smaller sections for each day of the week, coinciding more or less with the private reading. It would be difficult to establish exactly these divisions for the reading and study. The arrangements of Barukh and Portaleone are of too late a date, and seem to be of too artificial a character to be a guide for that purpose. We may be able to find some traces later on for some such division of a purely homiletical didactic nature not liturgical ; but it is first necessary to establish the fact that in addition to the division into Parashiyot, there was also another division which respected and preserved the older division into small sections, but divided the text according to its own needs and for its own purpose.

A name has come down to us for such a division which has often been misinterpreted. I mean the name *Piska* or *Pasuk*, the former the Aramaic, the latter the Hebrew term. This name changed in the course of time according to the new practice to which it had been put owing to the develop-

ment of the Massora. A new meaning had been given to it at a much later period, just as was the case with Perek and even with Parasha ; and the word Pasuk was identified with "verse." It has been shown above that the real name for verse in the Talmudic period was Kera or Katub. At a later time the word Pasuk, when its real meaning had been forgotten together with the use to which it had been put in the older schools, became obsolete, and, as it meant division, it was taken over by the Massorites to denote the verse. It cannot originally have meant "verse," because the Bible was not yet divided into Massoretic verses, and it is the exact word corresponding with the Samaritan Kiṣṣa, division or section. There are many indications that the original meaning of the word was a section. It would explain what has hitherto remained somewhat of a riddle, and which had been taken as a proof for the very great antiquity of the Massoretic division of the text into verses. When we find in the Talmud (Hag. 15a), or even later, that Aher the scholar, or Neron the Emperor, or Haman are said to have asked the boy coming home from the school to recite his Pasuk, hitherto translated verse, considering that the reply was seldom limited to one verse, and that the pupils were not expected to study in school only one verse during the day, the old interpretation cannot be correct ; but if it is understood that the boy was to quote something out of the Piska, of the *section* or daily lesson which he had studied, the difficulty is removed. And again, the Pissuk ṭe'amim mentioned in the Talmud, which has been taken to mean the division according to accents, though such accents had not yet been invented, will now be fully explained : for it means a division of the text according to its contents, according to the Ṭaam, in complete agreement with the definition of the word "ṭaam"—contents—used throughout in the Talmudic literature. This corresponds with the principle of the division of the Bible described before, guided by the

“ contents ” of the text. We shall now better understand the meaning of *Pesikta*, to which reference has already been made above ; and the reason why in some of the ancient Halachic and Midrashic works the section finished with the words *Seliḳ Piskā*. This agadic interpretation refers not to one verse, but to the whole section, of which only the first verse is quoted.

From the minute examination of the word *Seder* and of the use of it from a palæographical and philological point of view, as well as from the relation between a supposed different division of the Law, called *Sedarim*, and the ancient Midrashim as well as from the practice and use of the synagogue, the house, and the school, it is evident that a division such as is identified with *Sedarim* did not exist up to a very late period. On the other hand, it is perfectly clear that the practice of private study and homiletic interpretation brought about a subdivision of the text quite independent of the liturgy and public reading. It is then, no doubt, and that at a very late period, that probably the word standing as a kind of abbreviation for *Seder haparashiyot*, the “ order ” of the *Parashiyot*, or *Seder Ha-limmud*, the “ order ” of study, was used to denote these divisions of the text into three weekly portions. Such a division must have been originally identical with the *Piskā*, but as that word had already assumed a different meaning, rather that of verse than section, the other short expression—*Seder*—probably took its place. This division for purely homiletical and didactic purposes is preserved more or less clearly in the Later Midrashim, such as *Yelamdenu*, *Tanhuma*, and *Rabbot*. It must be clearly understood that though there is a close connection between these Midrashim and the subdivision or the larger subdivision of the weekly *Parasha*, that does not prove that it stood in any connection whatsoever with the public reading of the Law. It is obvious that the homiletical interpretation could not cover, in any one week, the whole of the weekly lesson.

No preacher could explain more than one small text, and no audience could be found to listen to an exposition going on for hours. There is no Parasha in these Midrashim which it would not take a long time to read, and much more time would be required to fully expound and explain by word of mouth all that is condensed in the written record. A division of the material was an obvious necessity, and the agadist or the interpreter—the preacher—started as a rule from one of the smaller Parashiyot (the closed or open section) with which the Sedarim in most cases coincide. On other and rare occasions he started with a verse which is now marked as a Seder. Even as late a compilation as the Agadat Bereshit shows still some independence of the division into Sedarim, for it just as often agrees with that division as it disagrees, and when it agrees in most cases “seder” and “parasha” are co-equal terms. The word seder or sedarim, therefore, denotes the agadic or didactic division of the Pentateuch. In fact, we find that the school is called Sidra, and the term in Leviticus Rabba, Resh Sidra, as head of the school, corresponding to the later Resh Metibta and Resh Kallah, fully bears out this interpretation. Looked upon from this point of view many of the difficulties which these Sedarim present, if taken as the weekly lesson, would instantly disappear. We shall then be able to understand better the peculiar discrepancy in the size of these Sedarim, to which reference has already been made. Why should certain Sedarim be limited to seven or eight verses and others be as long as two or three chapters? Then why should some of these Sedarim begin in the middle of a Parasha? It arises from the permission granted by the sages to the teacher to start his Piska, or Seder, wherever it suited him best, and as for the length, it will be observed that those chapters of the Bible which are either lessons for special Sabbaths, Festivals, or Holy Days, and therefore the subject of a special homiletical interpretation, e.g. the Pesikata, were no

longer made the subject of the regular Sabbatical homiletical interpretation. The agadist could be satisfied to pass it over almost entirely, and the teacher could equally deal with it almost at one stretch, for these chapters were also the special readings in the service of the festive seasons. Other small chapters contain certain biographical details which became the centre and nucleus of a large cycle of legends. They stood by themselves, as it were, and a small section like that in Genesis XXII. would suffice for an agadist for more than one homily if necessary. It will be remembered that when discussing the Mekhilta, I drew attention to the difference in the size of the various Masekhtot, some of which were very small. The principle in both cases is exactly the same. The explanation given for the difference in the size of the Sedarim holds good also for that of the Mekhilta, with which it runs parallel. We shall therefore be able to understand better the number of the Sedarim for the whole of the Bible: for they must be taken as a whole together. Unfortunately the markings of the divisions in the Midrashim of the prophetic books and of the Holy Writings seem to have been obliterated. In our manuscripts and printed editions they are made to coincide with the divisions of the Bible, even with the latest. Just as there is no fixed tradition about Parashiyot in the Prophets and Hagiographa, so there is no tradition affecting the Midrashim based upon these texts. But we cannot fail to recognise in the figures preserved to us as to the number of the Sedarim the same division of the whole Bible for a threefold weekly study as is preserved in the Agadat Bereshit. The whole of the Bible is divided into 462 Sedarim, that is three times three readings a week, each consisting of three portions, Law, Prophets, and Hagiographa. In this calculation, of course, we have to reckon also the Leap Years, which have four weeks more, and for which provision had to be made, hence the fluctuation in the number assigned

to the Pentateuch. It will be found thus that the real origin of the Sedarim must be sought in the school-room rather than in the synagogue. With this agrees also the late appearance in our literature of the word Sedarim with this meaning, which owes, no doubt, its origin to the Massoretic school that was anxious to find a word to designate this general division of the whole Bible. The word then appears for the first time, as far as I have been able to trace it, in the treatise Soferim (xvi. 10). The connection in which it appears is highly instructive.

The incident related in the Jer. Talmud of Rab. Joshua b. Levi (*v.* above) finding in a book of Agadah that the Law was divided into 175 Parashiyot, is here repeated, but enriched by the additional words, “and for this reason we have fixed them as Sedarim.” It was in a book of Agadah (*i.e.* of homilies) that R. Levi found the Law divided into 175 sections, and to these sections at a late period the name Sedarim was given. The whole rests on a homiletical and agadic incident, and the explanatory gloss in Soferim comes, no doubt, from the School of the Massorites. Another reference to the Sedarim is alleged to have been found in the passage in the Sheeltot, chapter I., and is contained, let it be noted, also in a legend or agadah referring to the punishment of the wicked in Gehinnom during the week. It is said that the Sabbath rest of the wicked finishes at a certain period “when the Israelites completed their Sedarim”; and this word has been taken to refer to the peculiar division of the Bible identified with that name. Anyone who had glanced at the passage in the Sheeltot would have found that nothing could be stranger than such an interpretation; for the author continues to explain: “when the Israelites had reached the Sedarim of the going out of the Sabbath,” meaning thereby the last verses of Psalm xc. and the whole of xci., which precede the Kiddusha De Sidra, *i.e.* the Kiddusha in *Uba Le Sion*. But this

legend does not stand alone. There are many parallels to it, one incomplete in Sanhed. 65*b*, another more complete in Tanḥuma Exodus Ki Tissa, paragraph 33, and a much more archaic and complete form in my *Exempla of the Rabbis*, No. xv., pp. 13 and 14, where the real translation of the passage reads: "when the Israelites finished the order (seder) of the service, including prayer, lessons, reading, and homilies." The reference to Job x. 22, taken from the Talmud Sotah 49*a*, is merely an allegorical interpretation, or a play upon words. The fact that this homiletical interpretation occurs already in the Talmud shows that there is not the slightest reference to any Bible lessons, and those who have based their argument on the Sheeltot have undoubtedly gone astray. It is not until we reach the *En Hakoreh*, a Massoretic grammatical treatise of the fifteenth or sixteenth century (South Arabian), that we find, and perhaps there alone, a clear identification of the title Sedarim with the division of the Bible in lessons arranged to suit a three-year cycle.*

A long space of time, however, had intervened between the Sheeltot and this other passage; and before leaving the historical investigation of the Sedarim it is worth while pointing out further changes which have taken place in the use of this term. It must be mentioned that Ben Asher, the famous Massorite, the author of the model codex on which Maimonides relied, who is also the author of the oldest Massoretic treatise, *Dikduke Hate'amim*, does not use the word Sedarim, as, in fact, no one did until the time of the "*En Hakoreh*" and Jacob ben Hayim (sixteenth century). Meanwhile, a certain confusion had arisen through the promiscuous use of the various terms for denoting divisions of the Bible; especially when each of the seven portions of the weekly lesson was also called Parasha. This word, then, had a threefold or fourfold meaning:

* I must add that I have searched in vain for the statement in the edition of Derembourg. I have not found the passage; only Ginsburg gives it in his *Introduction to the Bible* (page 32).

the general division according to subject ; the small division into open and closed sections ; the larger division into weekly portions or lessons ; and again, the small divisions of the weekly portion. The technical use in the legal compilations was reserved to the scholar, but for the popular use some arrangement had to be made, and whilst the Sephardim have kept the name *Parasha* for the weekly lesson, among other sections of the Jewish nation the name *Seder* or *Sidra*, practically an abbreviation of *Seder Haparashiyot*, became the common name for the weekly lesson. *Parasha* was then used for each of the seven sections of the *Seder*, and to this day the *Sedra* is the only name by which the weekly lesson is known among the Ashkenazic Jewry.

Before dealing with the supposed three-year cycle with which the *Sedarim* were alleged to have been identified or connected, it is advisable to recapitulate briefly the results which I have thus far obtained, for, if there is neither a palæographical trace of an ancient division of the Law into *Sedarim*, if there are no rules for the writing, if the name of *Seder* or *Sedarim* is on no occasion used in any other meaning but “order,” especially “order of reading” and “order of study,” if the ancient *Midrashim* were shown to be entirely independent of any such division agreeing with the *Sedarim*, if the division refers merely to the later practice of school reading and homiletical exposition, there is no room in the liturgy for such a division, and there has never been any connection between this division of a purely Massoretic and late origin with any public reading of the Law on Sabbaths and fixed seasons. Far from being an ancient division preceding that into weekly lessons, it was very late and of an ephemeral character. Nothing can therefore be based on this modern division to prove the existence of a three-year cycle, still less that it has ever been countenanced in Palestine over a large area, in great communities, and for a long period of time.

I turn now to the evidence which has been adduced to prove the existence of such a cycle. It will be found that there is only one reference in the whole of the Talmudic and Rabbinic literature to a supposed cycle of three years. In the Babylonian Talmud (Megilla 29a) a discussion is carried on as to the way in which the portion of Shekalim should be read at the beginning of the month of Adar. Rab. Tobi (Tobias) says the people of Ma'araba (B'nei Ma'araba) finish the Law in three years. It is doubtful whether Ma'araba—as has hitherto been assumed—means always only Palestine and the whole of Palestine. The real meaning of the word is the “west,” and it may just as well apply to any locality between Babylon and Jerusalem. It is well known that profound differences existed in many ways between almost every one of the large centres of Jews in these places, even between towns so close together as Sura, Pumpadita, and Nehardea. In Babylon itself various schools existed which differed on legal and, later on, on Massoretic questions, each one having its own teachings and traditions, even in matters Biblical. Equally profound are the differences between the various Massoretic schools in Galilee (Tiberius). The statement of Rab. Tobi is a mere *obiter dictum* of a man living at a great distance from Palestine. He himself may not have seen the practice at all, and he was telling it either from mere hearsay or in reference to one or another of those scattered Minhagim, which flourished so abundantly among the Jews of Palestine and Babylon. It was the very soil from which numerous Jewish sects sprang. They already existed there from olden times, and became more prominent later when the Karaite movement assumed such large proportions. We dare not, therefore, put into a single statement of this kind more than the author may have meant, as all the evidence adduced hitherto points to the contrary conclusion, and no other is found to support the former. Such an isolated statement is just as little proof

for the general practice as, for example, the passage quoted by Muller (note 25 to *Soferim* x. 8), that according to the statement of "Rabbotenu Shebe-Ma'araba," "seven or eight persons are sufficient for Minyan at Barekhu and Kaddish," a practice of which nobody has ever heard and of which no other trace is found. What is further very interesting is that even for this alleged three years' cycle there is no uniformity. According to the *Hilluf Minhagim*—a very late compilation of uncertain date—in which the differences between Babylon and Palestine are set down, it is expressly stated that they used to read the Torah not in three years, but in three and a half years, and that they celebrated *Simhat Torah* on whatever Sabbath the finishing of the reading of the Law happened to occur. Moreover, it is stated that the custom of one village was not the custom of another village. This reminds one very strongly of the Mohammedan calendar, according to which the Ramadan is continually shifting through all the months of the year. The statement of a three and a half years' cycle runs counter directly to the statement in the Talmud, where Rab. Tobi speaks only of a three years' cycle, and let it be noted in addition that the mention of the three and a half years' reading dates probably from the ninth or tenth century, when almost every community was split up into warring sects, each with its own tradition and Minhag.

Thus far the three or three and a half years' cycle rests on doubtful references. The commentaries of Rab. Hananel and Rashi throw no further light on the passage in the Talmud. As commentators they merely endeavour to explain the meaning of the text without questioning its authenticity; but the words of Rab. Hananel are very instructive. He says that "they divide the weekly Parasha into three sections," and he uses the word "posekin," that is, they make three Piska (or Pisikata) of each portion. He does not mention

Sedarim, and the actual division of the Sedarim certainly does not agree with such a division of the weekly lesson into three equal portions. The only one who refers to the practice more positively is Benjamin of Tudela, who says that in Cairo there existed two synagogues, one of the people of Palestine and one of the people of Babylon. The latter read the Law once during the year, and the other read it in three years, but on Shabuoth and Simḥat Torah the latter joined the former in the service in the synagogue. This is again a new version contrary to the Hilluf, and bearing out the peculiar vagaries of the Jewish communities at that time. Benjamin does not describe it as an eye-witness, he merely relates what he was told. I do not wish to imply that no such practice existed in a solitary synagogue. My contention is that it was only an isolated practice and certainly of a late date. It was not a generally recognised practice among the Jews of Palestine. This very statement of Benjamin proves it to have been a solitary instance, for Benjamin had just travelled throughout the length and breadth of Palestine. He describes the local customs very minutely and all the institutions he had visited. He is one of the oldest travellers who visited the Samaritans in Nablus, and gives us a vivid description of their synagogue and their life. If therefore it had really been a Palestinian custom he would have dealt at some length with it in his description of Palestine, or at least referred to it, and would not have mentioned it as a curiosity in one of the synagogues of Cairo. Cairo, it must be remembered, was the centre where many sects of Jews, Samaritans, Karaites, nondescripts lived together and often fought. No wonder if among them one synagogue existed with its own peculiar ways. But of how they divided and how they read the Bible no trace has been left.

Maimonides, who lived soon afterwards in Cairo, refers also to this custom rather contemptuously in *Hilkut Tefilah*, chapter XIII., paragraph 1, where he

simply says—after stating that the annual cycle was the only established custom throughout Jewry—that there are some who read the Torah in three years, but this is not an accepted custom. He, of course, chronicled and tabulated whatever was found as a definite statement in the Talmud; but though he records it, he none the less adds to it the qualifying statement that it was not a Minhag Pashut. He, moreover, may have heard of it as a local custom in Cairo; he does not even refer to the place where it was done, and simply mentions it to condemn it. It is sufficient, then, to point to the way in which Abraham, the son of Maimonides, refers to the people who follow such a practice as ignorant, arrogant men who deliberately alter the Law.* We have reached now the last evidence, and the only one in which the Sedarim are mentioned in connection with this supposed three years' cycle—the reference in the *En Hakorēh*. This is a grammatical treatise preceding some of the manuscripts written in Yemen.

A careful examination of the work will reveal the fact that the author shared in the veneration of Maimonides with the Jews of Yemen. He simply copies the word from Maimonides, and he uses the same vague phraseology (“There are some who read the Bible once in three years”) without saying who these people were, without referring to Palestine as the home of this practice, without any hint as to how or where this practice obtained. He does not even mention Cairo, although the Jews in Yemen stood in close contact with the Jews of Cairo. Moreover, the Yemenite MSS., to which this treatise serves as an introduction, though they mark the Sedarim on the margin like so many other Massoretic signs, divide the text into perikopes in accordance with the annual cycle; and no notice is taken of any other system of reading the Bible but the annual cycle through the rest of this Biblical treatise. It is clear that the author of the *Ēn Hakorēh* simply

* v. Büchler in *J.Q.R.*, Vol. V, 1893, page 420.

refers to the Massoretic notice, which he interpreted in his own way, forgetting that the rest of the Bible is also divided by the Massorites into Sedarim without any reference whatsoever to any liturgical use. Now this is the sum total of the entire tradition in the whole of the Jewish literature for the existence of the so-called three years' or three and a half years' cycle. We can see now that it may have been a custom practised in sporadic synagogues and among Jewish sectarians who flourished down to the thirteenth or fourteenth century. The so-called Zadokite documents, published recently by Dr. Schechter, in addition to the testimonies of Seadyah in his *Emunoth Ve-deoth* and *Shaharastani*, give us an insight into Jewish sectarial life, of which those who believe that the development of Judaism has been running on smoothly like an undisturbed stream have scarcely been aware. To such a sect many vagaries may have commended themselves, but, basing our investigation upon the clear evidence of facts, there is not a single proof that a three years' cycle had ever been the practice in Palestine, or that it had been known in antiquity. That the Bible had ever been divided to serve such a purpose is nothing but pure imagination, and the study of the Sedarim themselves disproves the possibility that they represent such a division used for liturgical purposes. The whole tradition is unanimous that the Law had been read once a year, that the basis of the weekly perikope rests upon a very old division of the text which has been retained throughout the ages. It has been preserved in the Hebrew, Greek, and Samaritan Bible, and the annual cycle is the only one recognised by Jews, Samaritans, Karaites, and Christians alike. Any deviation from this ancient and time-hallowed institution would be an arbitrary enactment, for which no justification can be claimed in tradition and practice.

APPENDIX

THE SAMARITAN CALENDAR

I AM publishing here for the first time a complete Samaritan Calendar. From Scaliger in the sixteenth to de Sacy in the nineteenth century many attempts have been made to obtain a complete copy of the Samaritan Calendar, but all in vain. Various astronomical tables have found their way into the Crawford Collection now incorporated with the Rylands Library in Manchester, and a few more similar MSS. are to be found in my collection. But these do not give us a clue to the actual religious calendar.

The religious year was not the object of those investigations, nor do the astronomical tables contain the slightest hint as to the manner in which the Festivals are kept, or the liturgy arranged.

Codd. Harl. 5481, Harl. 5495 of the British Museum, is also of no help in either of these directions. It deals neither with the principle of the astronomical calculations of the Samaritans, nor with the religious divisions of the time. It contains mostly chronological indications with introduction taken from old liturgical hymns. Not one, in fact, as far as I am aware, has hitherto had access to such a Samaritan Calendar arranged for practical purposes and on the lines of the usual calendar.

At my request such a Calendar for the year 1329 of the Hegira (Mohammedan Era), which corresponds with August, 1910,—July, 1911, was prepared for me by the High Priest. In addition to this Manuscript, Cod. 1150, of my collection I have another Calendar (Cod. No. 858) arranged only for nine months, with somewhat more ample rubrics referring to the religious ceremonies. A third one (Cod. No. 857) is arranged for fifteen months, but is very brief; a mere pocket edition with the scantiest possible information. A number of other MSS., with astronomical tables such as Codd. 820, 1148, 1149, complete my collection of Samaritan calendars and astronomical tables.

The principle according to which the Calendar is calculated by the Samaritans is considered to be a "mystery" (just like

the Jewish Sod Ha'ibbur) revealed by God to Adam, and then transmitted by Adam to Noah, the Patriarchs and Moses. It was then handed on to Pinehas the High Priest, son of Eleazar, who calculated it on the meridian of Sichem, and has thenceforward been preserved as a mystery by the successive High Priests unto this very day. The tradition is found in the closing chapter of the Samaritan Book of Joshua, edited by me, and in the oldest Chronicle, the Tolidoth ed. Neubauer.

No European scholars seem to have elucidated the Samaritan Calendar. Among my MSS. there is the Arabic work of Jakub ibn Ishak ibn Jakub ibn Abulfaraj (Cod. 1147), a writer of uncertain date (sixteenth to seventeenth century), who deals exhaustively with the Heshban Kushiya, the *true* calculation as they call their calendar. In the first part he gives the traditional history of the Samaritan Calendar and in the second the theory and the practice of its calculation.

It is not here the place to follow these points further up. I mention them only to show to those who are interested in the history of the Samaritan Calendar and the comparative study of these systems that new and, to my mind, ample materials are now within easy reach.

One cannot speak of the Calendar of the Jews, Samaritans and other sects without being reminded of the extraordinary importance attached to these calculations. They are the corner stone, nay, the pivot round which all the heresies revolve. The fundamental differences between the sects turn mostly round the Calendar, and the history of the first centuries of the Christian Church knows equally fierce battles waged round the fixing of dates and settling of the Calendar. With these we have, however, now nothing to do here. The object of publishing this Calendar is principally to exemplify the division of the Law by the Samaritans into Weekly Lessons, and to show the exact manner in which the reading of the Bible had been adjusted by them to the seasons of the year, how the Festivals fare, and incidentally how the annual cycle works out on Samaritan ground. Other details of importance have been included. I therefore reproduce the Calendar practically in its entirety. I have only omitted the intermediate counting of the days of the weeks, which are of no importance whatever and can easily be supplied by any intelligent reader. The Sabbaths are indicated by ש. With the exception of these figures *every other* item found in the Calendar has been reproduced. The MS. is of small size, but calligraphically though minutely

written. The facsimile represents the exact size of the two pages 3 and 4. The Calendar is arranged according to the Mohammedan months, no doubt for practical purposes. Living among the Mohammedans their Calendar is for the Samaritans their Civil Calendar; they must regulate their daily life in accordance with it. The heading therefore contains the astronomical determination of the Mohammedan New Moon and the corresponding date of the Greek or Christian Calendar is given, and curiously enough in accordance with the Old, i.e. the Julian style. The Gregorian Calendar or New Style is added. The former is called Rumi, that is the Byzantine or Greek and also the Old Style, and the other is called the New or modern calculation (Hesban) or Style.

The Samaritan month is not mentioned by name but by the numeral, whilst the usual Hebrew names are used by the Samaritans to denote the months of the solar year. As I am dealing with these points elsewhere it is sufficient to have mentioned them for the understanding of the Calendar. I have transliterated the Calendar in its entirety from the Samaritan characters into the Hebrew, and I have reproduced, first, all the headings, then the dates being arranged in four columns. I have on each occasion given *all* the four figures: 1st, the day of the week (Sunday, Monday, etc.); 2nd, the Mohammedan date of the month, which day in the month it was; 3rd, the date according to the Old Style—the Julian; 4th, the date of the New Style—the Gregorian. The comparison between these dates is thus made easy.

In addition to these four columns there is in the MS. a large space devoted to entries affecting the religious life of the Samaritans. The lessons of the Sabbaths, the dates of the Festivals, the New Moons and other important items bearing on their religious conceptions and practices. All these entries have been faithfully reproduced. We can see here week by week how they divided the Law and also the occasions on which the weekly Perikope was omitted and other Lessons substituted.

I have also reproduced all the astronomical entries about the New Moon, when it happened, at which hour and what fraction of the hour and the day it happened. I shall not dwell on these, for they offer quite an unexpected problem. It will be seen, namely, that the proclamation of the New Moon is made at the time of the full moon. A curious passage in *Josephus, Antiqq.* III., x. 5, may thus appear in a new light.

The Calendar has been literally translated so as to make it accessible to a wider circle interested in the numerous problems connected with these calendars. The readings of the Sabbaths have been of course fully reproduced. They form the most important part, as it is for the sake of the Sabbatical Lessons that this Calendar is being published. In the translation the references to the chapters and verses of the Pentateuch have been added to each of these lessons. In order to show the exact relation between the Biblical Lessons of the Samaritans and those of the Jews, I have added to each of these Bible Lessons the corresponding Lessons read by the Jews on each of the Sabbaths of that year.

Short notes added to the translation explain more fully some of the difficult points. In order to make the list of the Samaritan Bible Lessons more complete as found in actual life I have added also the list from the Calendar (Cod. 857) showing the permanency of the Institution and the manner in which these Lessons are read during the year. This Calendar starts with the eighth month and finishes with the ninth. It shows also slight discrepancies which are due to additional Sabbaths when the Parashiyot had to be subdivided. These I left untranslated as the references to the chapter and the verse of the Bible have been added, which make these divisions perfectly clear.

[P. 1] קבוץ חדש שעבאן והוא חדש החמישי בשעה ד ועשרה דקיקות מן יום הששי : המזדמן אל כג" יום מן תמוז במחשב קדמה : אשר ראשו יום החמישי והוא אחד ושלשים יום :

יומי השבוע : מספר ימי חדש שעבאן והו החמישי :
 חדש הרומי במחשב קדמה : וזה במחשב ימה : מן חדש אב :
 ו. א. כג. ה. זה ראש חדש החמישי והוא שעבאן :
 (ש) בו פרשה מן פינחס בן אלעזר אל אחר ספר במדבר :
 (ש) בו פרשה מן אלה הדברים אל ראו למדתי :
 א. י. א. יד. ראש חדש אב בחשבון קדמה :
 (ש) בו פרשה מן ראו למדתי אל כי יביאך : וזה הוא צמות הסכות :
 א. יז. ח. כא. קראת חדש החמישי על א.ב. מן לילת א :
 (ש) בו פרשה מן כי יביאך אל כי אתם עברים :
 ה. כח. יט. א. ראש חדש אילול בחשבון ימה :
 (ש) בו פרשה מן כי אתם : אל בנים אתם :

[P. 2] קבוץ חדש רמזון והוא חדש הששי בשעה עשתי עשר : וששה וחמשים דקיקה מן יום השבת המזדמן אל כב : מן אב במחשב קדמה : אשר ראשו יום חדה והוא אחד ושלשים : ראש חדשי שנת ג. בשמטה :

א. א. כב. ד. זה ראש חדש הששי והוא רמזון :
 (ש) בו פרשה מן בנים אתם : אל שופטים :
 ד. יא. א. יד. ראש חדש אילול בחשבון קדמה :
 (ש) בו פרשה מן שופטים אל כי יקח איש אשה :
 ב. טז. ו. יט. קראת חדש הששי על ט. נח. מן לילת השני :
 (ש) בו פרשה מן כי יקח איש אשה אל היום הזה :
 ז. כח. יח. א. בו פרשה מן היום הזה והיה כי יביאך : והוא ראש חדש תשרי בחשבון ימה :

[P. 3] קבוץ חדש שואל והוא חדש השביעי בשעה השנית ושנים וארבעים דקיקה מן יום השני המזדמן אל ב. מן אילול במחשב קדמה : אשר ראשו יום הרכיעי והוא שלשים יום :

ב. א. ב. ג. ראש מועד חדש השביעי : והוא שואל :
 (ש) בו לא יש פרשה : שבת עשרת יומי הסליחות :
 ד. י. כט. יב. יום הכפור העצום : וענות הנפש :
 ו. יב. א. יד. ראש חדש תשרי בחשבון קדמה :
 (ש) בו פרשה מן והיה כי יביאך אל אחר התורה :

- ב. מו. ד. יו. מועד חג הסוכות : ראש שבעת הימים :
 ד. יו. ו. ימ. קראת חדש השביעי על ת. כח. מן יום ג. ד. :
 (ש) שבת שבעת יומי חג הסוכות לא יש בו פרשה :
 א. כא. י. כג. ראש חדש תשרי בחשבן ימה :
 ב. כב. יא. כד. יום השמיני עצרת :
 (ש) בו פרשה מן בראשית אל ואדם ידע :
 ג. ל. ימ. א. ראש חדש מרחשבן בחשבן ימה :

[P. 4] קבוץ חדש די אלקעדה והוא חדש השמיני בשעה הששית וששה וחמשים דקיקה מן לילת הרביעי המזדמן אל כ. מן תשרי במחשבן קדמה : אשר ראשו יום הששי והוא אחד ושלושים יום :

- ד. א. כ. ב. ראש חדש אלקעדה והוא חדש השמיני :
 (ש) בו פרשה מן ואדם ידע אל אל לבו :
 (ש) בו פרשה מן אל לבו אל לך לך :
 ב. יג. א. יד. ראש חדש מרחשבן בחשבן קדמה :
 ה. מז. ד. יו. קראת חדש השמיני על ה. ד. מן יום ה. :
 (יט) בו פרשה מן לך לך אל ויהי אברם :
 (ש) בו פרשה מן ויהי אברם אל ויהוה פקד :
 ה. ל. יח. א. ראש חדש כסלים בחשבן ימה :

[P. 5] קבוץ חדש אלחנה והוא חדש התשיעי בשעה השנית וששה ועשרים יום (!) מן לילת הששי : לנו תשע ועשר יום מן חדש מרחשבן אשר ראשו יום השני והו שלשים יום :

- ו. א. ימ. ב. ראש חדש התשיעי והוא חדש אלחנה :
 (ש) בו פרשה ויהוה פקד אל אברם (!) זקן :
 (ש) בו פרשה מן ואברהם זקן אל ואלה תולדת יצחק :
 ד. יג. א. יד. ראש חדש כסלים בחשבן קדמה :
 ו. מז. ג. מז. קראת חדש העשירי על ד. מח. מן יום ו. :
 (ש) בו פרשה מן אלה תולדת יצחק אל וישא יעקב רגליו :
 (ש) בו פרשה מן וישא יעקב רגליו אל ותצא דינה :
 (ש) בו פרשה מן ותצא דינה אל ויוסף הורד :

[P. 6] קבוץ חדש מחרם והוא חדש העשירי שנת תשע ועשרים ושלוש מאות ואלף לממלכת ישמעאל : בשעה העשירית וארבע דקיקות מן יום השבת : והוא חדש ט. : לנו תשע עשר יום מן חדש כסלים בחשבן קדמה : אשר ראשו יום הרביעי [הרביעי] והוא אחד ושלושים יום :

- א. א. ימ. א. ראש חדש מחרם וראש חדש מיבת בחשבן ימה :
 (ש) בו פרשה מן יוסף הורד אל וליוסף ילדו :
 ז. יד. א. יד. (ש) בו פרשה מן וליוסף ילדו אל ויבא יוסף הביתה :
 וראש חדש מיבת לחשבן קדמה :
 א. מו. ב. מו. קראת חדש העשירי על ה. ו. מן לילת א.
 (ש) בו פרשה מן ויבא יוסף הביתה אל אל שדי נראה אלי :
 (ש) בו פרשה מן אל שדי נראה אלי אל אחר ספר בראשית :

- [P. 7] קבוץ חדש צפר והו אחד עשר בשעה השלישית וששה וחמשים דקיקה מן יום השני לגו שבע עשר יום מן חדש מיבת : אשר ראשו יום השבת והוא אחד ושלושים יום :
 ב. א. יו. ל. ראש חדש אחד עשר והוא ראש המופתים : והוא חדש צפר :
 ד. ג. ימ. א. ראש חדש שבט בחשבן ימה :
 (ש) בו פרשה מן ואלה שמות אל כי ידבר אליכם פרעה :
 (ש) בו פרשה מן כי ידבר אל ואל אהרן זה שבת חקת המסכות :
 ב. מו. לא. יג. קראת חדש אחד עשר על ד. מו. מן יום ב. :
 ג. מו. א. יד. ראש חדש שבט בחשבן קדמה :
 (ש) בו פרשה מן ואל אהרן אל בחדש השלישי זה שבת צמות הפסח :
 (ש) בו פרשה מן בחדש השלישי אל ויקחו לי תרומה :
 ג. ל. מו. כח. וחצי ורבע :

- [P. 8] קבוץ חדש רביע הראש והוא שנים עשר בשעה החמישית ושנים וארבעים דקיקה מן לילת הרביעי לגו ששה עשר יום מן חדש שבט אשר ראשו יום השלישי והוא שמנה ועשרים וחצי ורבע : חתמת חדשי שנת ג. בשמטה :
 ד. א. מו. א. ראש חדש שנים עשר וראש חדש הדר בחשבן ימה :
 (ש) בו פרשה מן ויקחו לי תרומה אל וזה הדבר :
 (ש) בו פרשה מן וזה הדבר אל ויתן אל משה :
 ג. יד. א. יד. ראש חדש הדר בחשבן קדמה :
 ד. מו. ב. מו. קראת חדש שנים עשר על ד. לב. מן לילת ד. :
 (ש) בו פרשה מן ויתן למשה אל ויעש את הקרשים :
 (ש) בו פרשה מן ויעש את הקרשים אל אחר ספר שמות :

- [P. 9] קבוץ חדש רביע השני והוא חדש הראשון בשעה הששית וששי וארבעים דקיקה מן יום החמישי והוא יום הששי :
 לגו שמנה עשר יום מן חדש הדר אשר ראשו יום השלישי והוא אחר ושלושים יום : בו מועד הפסח הברוך :

ז. א. ית. לא. ראש חדש הראשון והוא רביע השני :
 ז. ב. יט. א. ראש חדש ניסן בחשבון ימה : בו פרשה מן ויקרא אל משה
 אל צוי את בני ישראל :
 (ש) בו פרשה מן צוי אל וישא אהרן :
 ה. יד. לא. יג. יום טבח :
 ו. טו. א. יד. יום מועד הפסח הברוך : וראש חדש ניסן :
 קראת חדש הראשון על ט. ד. מן יום ה. ו. :
 (ש) זה שבת שבעת יומי חג המצות :
 א. יז. ג. מז. ראש יומי אל עומר אצל השמרים :
 ה. כא. ז. ב. יום מעד חג המצות :
 (ש) השבת הראש מן שבע השבתות בו פרשה מן וישא אהרן
 אל ואיש או אשה :

[P. 10] קבוצ' חדש גמאד הראש : והוא חדש השני : בשעה השנית :
 וששה וארבעים דקיקה מן לילת השבת לגו ששה עשר
 יום מן חדש ניסן : אשר ראשו יום השישי : והוא שלשים יום :
 ז. א. מז. כט. ראש חדש השני בו פרשה מן ואיש או אשה אל אחרי :
 ב. ג. יח. א. ראש חדש איאר בחשבון ימה :
 (ש) בו פרשה מן אחרי אל ובקצירכם :
 (ש) בו פרשה מן ובקצירכם אל מועדי :
 א. טו. א. יד. ראש חדש איאר בחשבון קדמה : וקראת חדש השני :
 (ש) בו פרשה מן מועדי אל אם בחקותי תלכו :
 (ש) בו פרשה מן אם בחקותי לאחר ויקרא :

[P. 11] קבוצ' חדש גמאד השני : והוא חדש השלישי בשעה עשרי
 עשר ושנים עשר דקיקה מן לילת חדה לגו חמשה עשר
 יום מן חדש איאר אשר ראשו יום חדה והוא אחד
 ושלשים יום :

א. א. טו. כח. ראש חדש השלישי והוא גמאד השני :
 ב. ב. טז. כט. יום קהלה :
 ד. ד. יח. לא. יום מעמד הר סיני :
 ה. ה. יט. א. ראש חדש סיון בחשבון ימה :
 (ש) השבת השביעי חתמת שבע השבתות :
 א. ה. כב. ד. מועד' חג השבעות חתמת אלעמר מפרק חמשיתי יומה :
 (ש) בו פרשה מן במדבר סיני אל נשא את ראש :
 ב. טז. ל. יב. קראת חדש השלישי על ג. ד. מן לילת ב. :
 ד. יח. א. יד. ראש חדש סיון בחשבון קדמה :

- (ש) בו פרשה מן נשא את ראש אל דבר אל אהרן :
 (ש) בו פרשה מן דבר אל אהרן אל שלח לך אנשים :
-

[P. 12] קבוצת חדש רנב והוא חדש הרביעי בשעה הששית וארבע וחמשים דקות מן יום השני והוא יום השלישי : לגו ארבע עשר יום מן חדש סיבן אשר ראשו יום הרביעי : והוא שלשים יום :

- ג. א. יד. כו. ראש חדש הרביעי והוא רנב :
 ז. ה. יח. א. ראש חדש תמוז בחשבון ימה : ובו פרשה מן דבר את ראש (!) אל ויקח קרח :
 ז. ט. כב. ה. קרח (!)
 (ש) בו פרשה מן ויקח קרח אל וישלח משה מלאכים :
 ז. ט. כט. יב. קראת חדש הרביעי אל ז. מ. מן יום ג. ד. :
 ו. יח. א. יד. ראש חדש תמוז בחשבון קדמה :
 (ש) בו פרשה מן וישלח משה אל פינחס בן אלעזר :
 (ש) בו פרשה מן פינחס אל ויהי המלקח :
-

List of Parashiyot from Samaritan Calendar (Cod. 857).

As actually read.

The Calendar contains 14 months, i.e. from the 8th of the previous to the 9th of the next.

P. 8.	השלישי		Genesis.	P. 1.	השמיני
26,3	אם בחקותי: אל עמלק:	8	4,1		ידע אדם 2
	כל קהלה: כל מקרתה:		8,21(b)		אל לבו 3
	שבת הדברים:		12,1		לך לך 4
	חג הקציר:		17,1		ויהי אברם 5
<i>Numbers</i>			21,1		ויהוה פקר 6
1,1	במדבר סיני	1		P. 2.	התשעי
4,1	נשא את ראש	2			
P. 9.	הרביעי		24,1		ואברהם זקן 7
8,2	דבר אל אהרן	3	25,19		ואלה תולדת 8
13,2	שלח לך	4	29,1		וישא יעקב רגליו 9
16,1	ויקח קרח	5	34,1		ותצא דינה 10
20,14	וישלח משה	6		P. 3.	העשירי
26,11	פינחס בן אלעזר	7			
P. 10.	החמישי		39,1		ויוסף הורד מצרימה 11
31,32	ויהי המלקח	8			וליוסף ילדיו 12a
<i>Deuteron:</i>			43,26		ויבא יוסף הביתה 12b
1,1	אלה הדברים	1	48,3		ואל שדי 13
4,5	ראו למדתי	2		<i>Exodus.</i>	P. 4.
7,1	כי יביאך	3			אחד עשר
P. 11.	השישי		1,1		ואלה שמות 1
11,31	כי אתם	4	7,9		כי ידבר 2
16,18	שופטים ושומרים	5	12,1		ואל אהרן 3
22,13	כי יקח איש	6			ויסע משה 4a
26,16	היום הזה	7		P. 5.	שנים עשר
P. 12.	השביעי		19,1		בחדש השלישי 4b
(!) [שבת עשרת יומי הסליות:]			25,2		ויקחו לי תרומה 5
30,1	ודיה כי יבאו	8	29,4		וזה הדבר 6
	חג הסכות		31,18		ויתן למשה 7
	שבת יומי חג הסכות		36,20		ויעש את הקרשים 8
<i>Genesis</i>	יום השמיני			<i>Leviticus.</i>	P. 6.
1,1	בראשית	1			הראשון
P. 13.	השמיני		1,1		ויקרא למשה 1
4,1	והאדם ידע	2	6,2		ציו את בני ישראל 2
6,17	ואני הנני	3	9,22		וישא אהרן 3
8,21(b)	אל לבו	4		P. 7.	השני
12,1	לך לך	5			
P. 14.	התשעי		13,38		איש או אשה 4
17,1	ויהי אברם	6	16,1		אחרי 5
21,1	ויהוה פקר	7	19,9		הפסח השני 6a
24,1	ואברהם זקן	8	23,2		ובקצירכם 6b
25,19	אלה תולדת יצחק	9			מוערי:

Cod. 1150

(Page 1)

Conjunction of the month Shaban, which is the Fifth Month 0 hour 10 minutes of the sixth day, which happens to be on the 23rd Tammuz according to the Old Style, whose first is on Thursday and which is of 30 days.

(The four columns are marked as follows.)

1. The day of the week. 2. The number of days of the month Shaban, which according to the Mohammedan Calendar is the seventh. 3. This column is the month of the Rumi [according to the Eastern Calendar (Old Style)] and the 4th is the modern calculation (New Style). This is here the month of Ab. [In the Jewish Calendar it was the month of Tammuz.]

Friday. 1. 23. 5. This is the beginning of the month which is Shaban, the 5th August, 1910.

Sabbath. On it the Parasha from Pinehas the son of Eleazar until the end of the book Bemidbar. (They read here evidently the whole of the rest of the Book of Numbers. Numb. 25, 11. to end. The Jews read on same Sabbath (August 6, Ab. 1) Massē. Numb. 33, 1. to end of the book.)

Sabbath. On it the Parasha from "Ele ha-debarim" (Deut. 1, 1.) until "behold I have taught you" (Deut. 4, 5.). (August 13th, Jewish Lesson, Deut. 1, 1-3., 22.).

Sabbath. The Parasha from "behold I have taught you" (Deut. 4, 5.) to "when he will bring thee" (Deut. 7, 1.). (August 20th, Jewish Lesson, Deut. 3, 22-7., 11.). This Sabbath is the Samot of Succoth. (*Note.*—Samot, a peculiar calendaristic term used by the Samaritans for a festive season, or rather a special Sabbath before the two festive seasons Succoth and Pesach, each time *six* weeks before the festival. They have special collections of prayers for these Samot (junction), but they do not seem to know the origin and true meaning. It is not here the place to discuss these Samot.)

Sunday. 17. 8. 21. Proclamation of the New Moon (i.e. Full Moon) of the Fifth Month for Sunday and Monday from the night of Sunday. [August 21st.]

Sabbath. Parasha from "When he will bring thee" (Deut. 7, 1.) till "for ye are passing" (Deut. 11, 31.). (August 27th, Jewish Lesson, Deut. 7, 12. to 11, 25.)

Thursday. 28. 19. 1. New Moon of Elul according to New Style. [September 1st.]

Sabbath. Parasha from "for ye are, etc." (Deut. 11, 31.) to "ye are sons" (Deut. 14, 1.). (September 3rd, Jewish Lesson, Deut. 11, 26-16, 17.)

(Page 2)

Conjunction of the month Ramadan, which is the Sixth Month on the 11th hour 56 minutes of Sabbath, which corresponds to the 22nd Ab according to Old Style, whose first is on the Sunday and is of 31 days.

The beginning of the third year of Shemittah.

Sunday. 1. 22. 4. New Moon of the Sixth Month. (Jewish Elul. The Jews have two days New Moon, Sunday and Monday; the Samaritans only Sunday.)

Sabbath. Parasha from "ye are sons" (14, 1.) to "judges and officers" (16, 18.). (September 10th, Jewish Lesson, Deut. 16, 18-21, 9.)

Wednesday. 11. 1. 14. First of the month of Elul Old Style.

Sabbath. Parasha from "judges and officers" (16, 18.) to "let a man take a wife" (22, 13.). (September 17th, Jewish Lesson, Deut. 21, 10-25, 19.)

Monday. 16. 6. 19. On it is the proclamation of the New Moon, 9 hours 58 minutes of the 2nd night.

Sabbath. Parasha from "let a man take a wife" (Deut. 22, 13.) to "this day" (Deut. 26, 16.). (September 22nd, Jewish Lesson, Deut. 26, 1-29, 9.)

Sabbath. 28. 18. 1. Parasha from "this day" (Deut. 26, 16.) until "when it will come upon thee" (Deut. 30, 1.).^a (October 1st, Jewish Lesson, Deut. 29, 10-30, 20.)

[^a *Note.*—This is evidently the Samaritan reading of Deut. 30, 1.]

And this is the first day of Tishri according to the New Style. [October 1st.]

(Page 3)

The conjunction of the month Shawwal, the Seventh Month 2 hours 42 minutes of Monday, corresponding to the 20th of Elul, Old Style, whose first is Wednesday and is of 30 days.

Monday. 1. 30. 3. The beginning of the First Festival of the Seventh Month. This is Shawwal. [October 3rd.] (The Samaritans were one day before the Jewish Rosh Hashanah, for Jewish Rosh Hashanah was on October 4th.)

Sabbath. No Parasha. It is the Sabbath of the ten days of Penitence. (October 8th, Jewish Lesson, Deut. 31, 1-31, 30.)

Wednesday. 10. 29. 12. The great awe inspiring Day of Atonement, the day of chastisement of the soul. [October 12th.]

Friday. 12. 1. 14. First day Tishri, O.S. [October 14th.]

Sabbath. The Parasha from "when it will come upon thee" (Deut. 30, 1.) to the end of the Law. (October 15th, Jewish Lesson, Deut. 32, 1-52.)

Monday. 15. 4. 17. The Festive Season of the Feast of Tabernacles. The beginning of the Seven Days. [October 17th.]

Wednesday. 17. 6. 19. The proclamation of the New Moon of the Seventh Month is 8 hours 29 minutes of the night of Tuesday to Wednesday. [October 19th.]

Sabbath. That of the Seven Days of Tabernacles. On it no Parasha. [October 22nd. The Jews also no Parasha.]

Sunday. 21. 10. 23. First day Tishri, N.S. [October 23rd.]

Monday. 22. 11. 24. The Eighth Day of 'Aşeret. [October 24th.]

Sabbath. Parasha from "In the beginning" (Gen. 1, 1.) to "Adam knew" (Gen. 4, 1.). (October 29th, Jewish Lesson, Gen. 1, 1-6, 8.)

Tuesday. 30. 19. 1. First day Marḥeshban, N.S. [November 1st.]

(Page 4)

Conjunction of the month Dul Kaddar, the Eighth Month 6 hours 56 minutes of the night of Wednesday, corresponding to the 20th Tishri, O.S., whose first is Friday and is of 31 days.

Wednesday. 1. 20. 2. New Moon of Kada which is the Eighth Month. [November 2nd. This is the first of the two days New Moon of the Jewish Month Marḥeshvan.]

Sabbath. Parasha from "and Adam knew" (Gen. 4, 1.) until "unto his heart" (Gen. 8, 21b). (November 5th, Jewish Lesson, Gen. 6, 9-11, 22.)

Sabbath. Parasha from "unto his heart" (Gen. 8, 21b) to "now the Lord said . . . get thee out" (12, 1.). (November 12th, Jewish Lesson, Gen. 12, 1-17, 27.)

Monday. 13. 1. 14. First day Marḥeshban, O.S. [November 14th.]

Thursday. 16. 4. 17. The proclamation of the New Moon of the Eighth Month 5 hours 4 minutes of Thursday. [October 17th.]

Sabbath. Parasha from "now the Lord said . . . get thee out" (Gen. 12, 1.) to "Abraham was" (17, 1.). (November 19th, Jewish Lesson, Gen. 18, 1-22, 24.)

Sabbath. Parasha from "and Abram was" (Gen. 17, 1.) to "and the Lord remembered" (21, 1.). (November 26th, Jewish Lesson, Gen. 23, 1. to 25, 18.)

Thursday. 30. 18. 1. First day Kislem, N.S. [December 1st.]

(Page 5)

Conjunction of the month Hijja, the Ninth Month 2 hours 26 minutes* of the night of Friday, corresponding to the 19th Marheshban, whose first is Monday and is of 30 days.

Friday. 1. 19. 2. The beginning of the Ninth Month. This is the month Al Hijja. [December 2nd.] (New Moon of the Jewish month Kislev.)

Sabbath. Parasha from "and the Lord remembered" (Gen. 21, 1.) until "and Abraham was old" (Gen. 24, 1.). (December 3rd, Jewish Lesson, Gen. 25, 19-28, 9.)

Sabbath. Parasha from "and Abraham was old" (Gen. 24, 1.) to "and these are the generations of Isaac" (Gen. 25, 19.). (December 10th, Jewish Lesson, Gen. 28, 10-32, 2.)

[*Note.*—It is to be noted the Parasha read to Jewish bridegroom on the Sabbath started from Gen. 24, 1.]

Wednesday. 13. 1. 14. The beginning of the month Kislem, O.S. [December 14th.]

Friday. 15. 3. 16. The proclamation of the Tenth (? Ninth) Month 4 hours 48 minutes of Friday. [December 16th.]

Sabbath. Parasha from "these are the generations of Isaac" (Gen. 25, 19.) to "and Jacob lifted up his feet" (29, 1.). (December 17th, Jewish Lesson, Gen. 32, 3-36, 43.)

Sabbath. Parasha from "and Jacob lifted up his feet" (Gen. 29, 1.) to "and Dinah went out" (34, 1.). (December 24th, Jewish Lesson, Gen. 37, 1-40, 23.)

Sabbath. Parasha from "and Dinah went out" (34, 1.) to "Joseph went down" (39, 1.). (December 31st, Jewish Lesson, 41, 1-44, 17.) [This is the first of the two days New Moon of the Jewish month Tebet.]

(Page 6)

Conjunction of the month Muharram, the Tenth Month, the year 1329 of the Mohammedan rule, 10 hours 4 minutes of the day of Sabbath, and that is month (written by mistake) corresponding to the 19th Kislem, O.S., whose first is Wednesday and has 31 days.

* Written day instead of minutes in MS. by mistake.

Sunday. 1. 19. 1. Beginning of the month Muharram. Beginning of the month Tebet, N.S. [January 1st, 1911.]

Sabbath. Parasha from "and Joseph went down" (39, 1.) to "unto Joseph were born" (41, 50.). (January 7th, Jewish Lesson, Gen. 44, 18-47, 27.)

Sabbath. 14. 1. 14. Parasha from "unto Joseph were born" (41, 50.) until "and Joseph came into the house" (43, 26.). (January 14th, Jewish Lesson, Gen. 47, 28. to end of Gen.) The first of the month Tebet, O.S.

Sunday. 15. 2. 15. The proclamation of the Tenth Month 6 hours 6 minutes of the night of Sunday. [January 15th.]

Sabbath. Parasha from "and Joseph came into the house" (Gen. 43, 26.) until "The god Shaddai appeared unto me" (48, 3.). (January 21st, Jewish Lesson, Ex. 1, 1-6, 1.)

Sabbath. Parasha from "The god Shaddai appeared unto me" (48, 3.) unto the end of the Book of Genesis. (January 28th, Jewish Lesson, Ex. 6, 2-9, 35.)

(Page 7)

The conjunction of the month Saffar, that is the Eleventh Month 3 hours 56 minutes of the day of Monday, corresponding to the 17th day of Tebet, whose first is Sabbath and has 31 days.

Monday. 1. 17. 30. The Eleventh Month. This is the beginning of the miracles. This is the month Saffar. (This is the name of the month in which the portions of the Bible are read containing the miracles in Egypt.) [January 30th.] (Jewish month Shebat one day New Moon.)

Wednesday. 3. 19. 1. Beginning of the month Shebat, N.S. [February 1st.]

Sabbath. Parasha from "and these are the names" (Ex. 1, 1.) until "and when Pharaoh will speak unto you" (7, 8.). (February 4th, Jewish Lesson, Ex. 10, 1-13, 16.)

Sabbath. Parasha from "and when Pharaoh will speak unto you" (Ex. 7, 8.) until "and unto Aaron" (12, 1.). And this is the Sabbath of Mesabot. (February 11th, Jewish Lesson, Ex. 13, 17-17, 16.)

Monday. 15. 31. 13. The proclamation of the New Moon of the Eleventh Month 4 hours 46 minutes of Monday. [February 13th.]

Tuesday. 16. 1. 14. Beginning of the month Shebat, O.S. [February 14th.]

Sabbath. Parasha from "and unto Aaron" (Ex. 12, 1.) until "on the third month" (19, 1.). (February 18th, Jewish Lesson, Ex. 18, 1-20, 26.) This is the Sabbath of the Samot of Pesach.

Sabbath. Parasha from "on the third month" (Ex. 19, 1.) to "and they shall take unto me a heave offering" (25, 1.). (February 25th, Jewish Lesson, Ex. 21, 1-24, 18.)

Tuesday. 30. 15. 28. A half and a quarter. It means a half day and a quarter day to complete the solar year. [February 28th.] This is the first of the two days New Moon of Adar.

(Page 8)

The conjunction of the month Rabi I, which is the Twelfth Month, and is on the 5th hour 42 minutes of the night of Wednesday, which is the 16th of the month of Shebat, whose beginning is on Tuesday, which is of 28 days and a half and a quarter. The conclusion (!) of the third year of the Shemitah.

Wednesday. 1. 15. 1. Beginning of the Twelfth Month Hadar, N.S. [March 1st.] (This is the second day New Moon of the Jewish month Adar.)

Sabbath. Parasha from "and they shall take unto me a heave offering" (Ex. 25, 1.) until "this is the word" (29, 1.). (March 4th, Jewish Lesson, Ex. 25, 1-27, 19.)

Sabbath. Parasha from "this is the word" (Ex. 29, 1.) until "and he gave unto me" (31, 18.). (March 11th, Jewish Lesson, Ex. 27, 20-30, 10.)

Tuesday. 14. 1. 14. Beginning of the month of Hadar, O.S. [March 14th.]

Wednesday. 15. 2. 15. The proclamation of the Twelfth Month, 4 hours 32 minutes of the Wednesday. [March 15th.]

Sabbath. Parasha from "and he gave unto me" (Ex. 31, 18.) until "and he gave the boards" (36, 20.). (March 18th, Jewish Lesson, Ex. 30, 11-34, 35.)

Sabbath. Parasha from "and he gave the boards" (Ex. 36, 20.) to the end of the book Shemot. (March 25th, Jewish Lesson, Ex. 35, 1-38, 20.)

(Page 9)

The conjunction of Rabi II, which is the First Month on the 6th hour 46 minutes of Thursday and it is the 6th day, which is the 18th day of the month of Hadar, whose first is the

Tuesday and which is of 31 days. In this is the feast of the blessed Pesah.*

Friday. 1. 18. 31. New Moon of the First Month, and it is Rabi II. [March 31st. This is the second day of New Moon of the Jewish Month Nissan.]

Sabbath. 2. 19. 1. Beginning of the month Nissan, N.S. Parasha from "and he called unto Moses" (Lev. 1, 1.) until "command the children of Israel" (6, 1.). (April 1st, Jewish Lesson, Lev. 1, 1-6, 7.)

Sabbath. Parasha from "command the children of Israel" (Lev. 6, 1.) until "and Aaron took" (9, 22.). (April 8th, Jewish Lesson, Lev. 6, 8-8, 35.)

Thursday. 14. 31. 13. The day of the slaughter (of the Paschal Lamb). [April 13th.]

Friday. 15. 1. 14. The day of the feast of the blessed Pesah. First day Nissan, O.S., the proclamation of the First Month is 9 hours 4 minutes from Thursday to Friday. [April 14th.]

Sabbath. This is the Sabbath of the seven days of unleavened bread (Maṣṣot). [April 15th.]

Sunday. 17. 3. 16. The first day of the 'Omer. [April 16th.]

Thursday. 21. 17. 20. The feast day of the festival of Maṣṣot. [April 20th.]

Sabbath. The first Sabbath of the seven Sabbaths. Parasha from "and Aaron took" (Lev. 9, 22.) until "man or woman" (13, 38.). (April 22nd, Jewish Lesson, Lev. 9, 1-11, 47.)

(Page 10)

The conjunction of Djumada I, which is the Second Month 2 hours 46 minutes on the day of Sabbath, corresponding with the 16th of the month of Nissan, whose first was on a Friday and is of 30 days.

Sabbath. 1. 16. 29. Beginning of the Second Month. Parasha from "man or woman" (Lev. 13, 38.) until "after the death" (16, 1.). (April 29th, Jewish Lesson, Lev. 12, 1-15, 33.) [This is the second day New Moon of the Jewish Month Iyyar.]

Monday. 3. 18. 1. Beginning of the month Iyyar, N.S. [May 1st.]

Sabbath. Parasha from "after the death" (Lev. 16, 1) to

* Meaning the calculation is from 6 in the afternoon, evidently when according to the Jewish calculation the night of the 6th day had begun.

"and when ye reap the harvest" (19, 9.). (May 6th, Jewish Lesson, Lev. 16, 1-20, 27.)

Sabbath. Parasha from "and when ye reap the harvest" (Lev. 19, 9.) until "feasts" (23, 1.). (May 13th, Jewish Lesson, Lev. 21, 1-24, 27.)

Sunday. 16. 1. 14. Beginning of the month of Iyyar, O.S., and the proclamation of the Second Month 1 hour 24 minutes of the second day. [May 14th.]

Sabbath. Parasha from "feasts" (Lev. 23, 1.) to "if in my statutes" (26, 3.). (May 20th, Jewish Lesson, Lev. 25, 1-end of the book.)

Sabbath. Parasha from "if in my statutes" (Lev. 26, 3.) to the end of the book. (May 27th, Jewish Lesson, Numb. 1, 1-4, 20.)

(Page 11)

Conjunction of Djumada II, the Third Month 11 hours 12 minutes of the Sunday corresponding to the 15th of the month Iyyar, whose first was on Sunday and it is of 31 days.

Sunday. 1. 15. 28. Beginning of the Third Month, which is Djumada II. [May 28th. This is the first day New Moon of the Jewish month Sivan.]

Monday. 2. 16. 29. The day of the Gathering. [May 29th.]

Wednesday. 4. 18. 31. The day of the standing before Mt. Sinai. [May 31st.]

Thursday. 5. 19. 1. Beginning of the month of Siban N.S. [June 1st.]

Sabbath. The Seventh Sabbath, the conclusion of the seven Sabbaths. [June 3rd. Jewish Feast of Weeks, Friday and Saturday.]

Sunday. 8. 22. 4. The Feast of the Festival of the Weeks, the conclusion of the 'Omer at the going out of the 50 days. [June 4th.]

Sabbath. Parasha from "in the wilderness of Sinai" (Numb. 1, 1.) to "take the sum of the sons of Kehat" (Numb. 4, 1.). (June 10th, Jewish Lesson, Numb. 4, 21-7, 89.)

Monday. 16. 30. 12. The proclamation of the Third Month 3 hours 4 minutes of the night of Monday. [June 12th.]

Wednesday. 18. 1. 14. Beginning of the month Siban, O.S. [May 14th.]

Sabbath. Parasha from "take the sum of the sons of Kehat" (Numb. 4, 1.) until "speak unto Aaron" (6, 22.). (June 17th, Jewish Lesson, Numb. 8, 1-12, 16.)

Sabbath. Parasha from "speak unto Aaron" (Numb. 6, 22.) until "said" (13, 1.). (June 24th, Jewish Lesson, Numb. 13, 1. to 15, 41.)

(Page 12)

The conjunction of the month Rajab, which is the Fourth Month 6 hours 54 minutes of Monday, which is (really) Tuesday, corresponding to the 14th day of the month Sibān, whose first is Wednesday and has 30 days.

Tuesday. 1. 14. 27. Beginning of the Fourth Month and it is Rajab. [June 27th. This is the second day New Moon of the Jewish month Tammuz.]

Sabbath. 5. 18. 1. Beginning of Tammuz, N.S: Parasha from "speak unto the head" [this is here a mistake in MS., should be "said"] (Numb. 13, 1.) to "Korah took" (16, 1.). (July 1st, Jewish Lesson, Numb. 16, 1-18, 32.)

Wednesday. 9. 22. 5. Proclamation of the New Moon (rest missing, left incomplete, evidently started by mistake, v. below). [July 5th.]

Sabbath. Parasha from "Korah took" (Numb. 16, 1.) until "Moses sent messengers" (20, 14.). (July 8th, Jewish Lesson, Numb. 19, 1-25, 9.)

Wednesday. 16. 29. 12. The proclamation of the Fourth Month 6 hours 26 minutes from Tuesday to Wednesday. [July 12th.]

Friday. 18. 1. 14. Beginning of the month of Tammuz, O.S. [July 14th.]

Sabbath. Parasha from "Moses sent messengers" (Numb. 20, 14.) until "Pinehas" (25, 11.). (July 15th, Jewish Lesson, Numb. 25, 10-29, 40.)

Sabbath. Parasha from "Pinehas" (Numb. 25, 11.) to "and the booty was" (31, 32.) [In some MSS. there is a Parasha marked also at 27, 1.] (July 22nd, Jewish Lesson, Numb. 30, 1. to end of the book.)

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

University of California
SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90024-1388
Return this material to the library
from which it was borrowed.

NON-RENEWABLE

OCT 27 1992

RE 2 WKS FROM DATE

ILL/526



UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY
A 001 246 131



ia U